The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1932 NUMBER 903

Contents

The Week 136

Editorials

Taxing the Have-Nots 138
The Hindenburg Victory 140
Europe and Stimson's Doctrine 141

General Articles

Brokers and Pioneers ..... Edmund Wilson 142
Peace—by Pact or Covenant? ..... John Dewey 145
Fire Flowers (verse) ..... Carl Sandburg 147
Chaos or Control: III ..... George Soule 148
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 152
Return and Exhibition ..... Stark Young 153

Correspondence 155

Reviews of Books

Here Are Liberals ..... James Rorty 157
Finesse of Mind ..... Lindsay Rogers 158
Enemy Alien ..... Slater Brown 159
Raw Leaf ..... Edward Dahlberg 159
The Old Enemy ..... Cuthbert Wright 160
Book Notes 160

The Week

THE suicide of Ivar Kreuger is one of those events which, told in a novel, would be dismissed as too wildly improbable for anyone's attention. The public had heard of Kreuger as the "Swedish Match King," and knew that he was a man of great wealth and extensive interests. There were few, however, who realized the enormous role he played in international finance, or that his death could so seriously affect the stock markets of the entire world. For our part, what interests us most in the life and death of Kreuger is the shocking waste of human material which is revealed. Here was a man with a first-class brain, who began his career by rationalizing one business after another, putting them on a plane of superior efficiency; his financial adventures were the outgrowth of these activities. In the end, the world of speculation for private profit in which he moved could only offer him—death. Yet he might have been an enormously useful citizen of such a country as Russia, or of any other with an intelligently managed scheme of life. Kreuger's suicide was not merely a personal tragedy; it was an indictment of

MR. George Eastman's suicide is an entirely different matter from that of Ivar Kreuger. Kreuger, a comparatively young man, killed himself because things were going badly for him. Eastman, in his eighth decade, died by his own hand because, as he said in the note he left, addressed "to my friends," "my work is done. Why wait?" This is suicide in the manner of the ancient Romans, who believed that it is every man's privilege to quit the world whenever he chooses. Eastman's act will of course arouse a storm of controversy, which will not be settled by any appeal to logic, since one's attitude toward suicide is determined by fundamental emotional conditioning. We believe, however, (though there is no way to prove it) that an increasing number of Americans hold the Roman attitude, and will see nothing reprehensible in suicide under these conditions.

THE first direct vote on prohibition since the law was put into effect took place this week in the House of Representatives. The issue was on the question of bringing before the House the Beck-Linthicum resolution proposing a new constitutional amendment which would make each state its own arbiter in regard to prohibition. The vote was of course lost, as everyone knew it would be; but the Wets showed surprising strength, registering 187 votes to 227 for the Drys. A number of members abstained from voting, but there is no evidence that these absentees would have changed the result particularly one way or the other. With another thirty votes, the Wets would have had a majority of the entire House, though they would still be seventy votes short of the two-thirds required for submission of a constitutional amendment to the country. Major Henry H. Curran, leader of the propaganda against prohibition, estimates that the Wets have won a hundred votes in Congress in the past two years, and jubilantly declares that with another election they will have the necessary two-thirds majority.

UNTIL a few months ago, the common belief was that there was practically no chance that a constitutional amendment putting an end to na-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try. They pointed out that such an amendment, to be successful, must be adopted by three quarters of the states, which means that any thirteen states could block it indefinitely. There are at least thirteen states in the West and South, having among them only 8 or 10 percent of the population, which have long been strongly in favor of prohibition, several of them having it written into their state Constitutions. Now, however, the rising tide of anti-prohibition sentiment is becoming so strong that few reasonable individuals are willing to venture Dry prophecies. The Literary Digest is making a nationwide test of sentiment, and has now received more than 2,000,000 ballots from thirty-eight states. These show a Wet majority in every state except Kansas, and a total Wet vote of more than three to one. Nebraska goes Wet by nearly two to one; Iowa by five to three; Colorado three to two; Georgia two to one, Indiana, two to one; Minnesota three to one; Ohio, two and one-half to one. Even in Kansas, the Drys are leading at present by less than 2,000 votes in a total of 33,000. If these figures properly represent the feeling of the country—and we believe that they do—then the end of prohibition is at last in sight.

THE trial of the nineteen members of the National Miners' Union who are now in Kentucky jails charged with criminal syndicalism has been set for May 26, although there is a rumor that they may not be tried until next fall. At present, attempts are being made to raise bail for them . The International Labor Defense, which is handling the case, recently announced that three of the prisoners have been removed from Pineville to Harlan, where they are now under the care of the notorious Sheriff Blair. Incredible as it may sound, there is a perfectly genuine danger that these prisoners may be lynched; they have already been threatened with "a ride" by an organization of business men similar to that which ran the independent writers' committee out of the state last month. Recently the court has forbidden the prisoners to see anyone, even their local attorney, and they have been refused the privilege of receiving or sending out letters. The I.L.D. is making desperate efforts to raise bail for them. Only a little more than a thousand dollars is needed, but unless it is immediately forthcoming there is, as we have said, serious danger that the nineteen prisoners may be granted that type of mob justice which Kentucky seems to have substituted recently for the justice of her courts.

SOON the Kentucky miners may have their day in the Senate. As a result of recent charges against the courts and officials of Harlan and Bell Counties, a resolution calling for an investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary was introduced by Senator Costigan, with the help of Senator

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quiry to determine whether federal laws—particularly the postal laws, the interstate commerce laws and the Bill of Rights—have been violated, and if so by whom, and for what reasons. It has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which will probably hold a hearing to determine whether the resolution should be favorably reported to the Senate. This hearing in itself will help to focus attention on the degree to which even the best of laws can be nullified during a class struggle, when all the machinery of justice is in the hands of the ruling class. If the investigation is finally ordered by the Senate, much more will be accomplished. True, no subcommittee of Senators can raise the wages of the miners by as much as a penny a day, but it can at least break the situation open, permit reporters to gather the news without being shot or ridden out of town, overawe the gun thugs by the authority of its presence, and perhaps end the general reign of terror. The Kentucky miners are not broken or cowed; given the shadow of a chance, they can look out for their own interests.

IN Chicago, where it is estimated that there are 624,000 unemployed and where relief funds were being spent at the rate of $100,000 a day during the month of February until they were exhausted, a committee of citizens, chosen by the Chicago Workers' Committee on Unemployment, held open hearings to give an opportunity for the various members of the community to tell how the depression has affected them. During the hearings the Committee interviewed 175 people representing the unemployed and landlords, grocers, social workers and business men, the purpose being to gather definite data on the condition of the impoverished masses in Chicago. The final report, which was recently made public, states that the "situation bears all the earmarks of a famine . . . malnutrition is prevalent and starvation is far from unusual." The report further states that lowered resistance to disease is widespread, that there is a general breakdown in personal and family morale and that a complete collapse of community moral standards has occurred. Petty thievery has become widespread and the stealing of food, fuel and various kinds of merchandise has increased in alarming proportions. The report ends with a confession of the complete failure of the charitable organizations to supply adequate aid.

WILL the Lindbergh kidnaping result in effective steps to put an end to this most outrageous of all rackets? We should like to believe that it will; but we are aware of no evidence that such a development is likely. To be sure, Mussolini has destroyed the Mafia in Italy; but there is no parallel between conditions there and in the United States. Certainly kidnaping will not be

against it; Americans today are thoroughly disillusioned, and rightly so, about the possibility of effecting a reformation by passing new statutes. It is no accident that kidnaping has in the past few years achieved such importance as an aspect of American life. Its roots go deep into the soil of our present civilization. In order to do away with it, we must make changes so profound that they will require many years, if indeed they are possible at all.

THE Lindbergh kidnaping provided the radio with its greatest opportunity in the field of news broadcasting. Both of the great networks, and some independent stations, undertook to give information to the country regarding the progress of the case. Never before was so much time allotted to news on the air, never were circuits maintained for such continuously long periods, or so much money spent. On the whole, however, it seems to us fair to say that the result was bitterly disappointing to the individual radio listener who wanted to find out what developments had taken place. At the best, the announcement took only a minute or two, and was usually given not oftener than every half hour. You were either obliged to keep your radio turned on continuously, thus listening to large quantities of advertising matter which no sane human being could want to hear, or else you had to watch the clock and leap to the dials at the appointed moment—in which case you found, as often as not, that you were too late or that the announcement had been omitted and you must wait again. It has been suggested that the only satisfactory solution of the radio problem would be to have each station present one sort of material continuously all day long, so that the listener who wanted good music would turn the dials to a given station, the one in search of jazz would always know where to find it, and so on. Such a thing, of course, would not be possible under our present American system; but the difficulties encountered by those who tried to get news of the Lindbergh kidnaping from the radio suggest how desirable such a reorganization would be.

MISS Roszika Dolly, the international playgirl, has just arrived from Europe. According to the news reports, which presumably were circulated by her press agent, she brought twelve trunks of clothing with her—fifty pairs of shoes, forty hats, fifteen evening gowns, a large assortment of dresses and thirteen pocketbooks. For the special benefit of Miss Dolly and her press representative, we are happy to state that the Emergency Committee for Strikers' Relief (Room 1001, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York City) is receiving clothing for the striking coal miners and would be delighted to get in touch with her. The Committee can use all or anything she can spare, with the exception, perhaps, of the thirteen pocketbooks. For one reason or another, pocketbooks have gone out of fashion down in the coal-mining regions where the Committee is distributing food and clothing.

Taxing the Have-Nots

THERE are enough Congressmen and Senators who are capable of reasoning, and enough who must at least pretend to care for the interests of the impecunious majority, so that the truth about the sales tax cannot be concealed. It is becoming recognized that the tax will not be paid by the manufacturer, but will be passed on to the consumer, if not at once, certainly as soon as market demand becomes more active. It is becoming recognized that it will bear upon all consumers in so far as they buy anything but food and fertilizer and Bibles—the consumers who cannot afford extra expense as well as those who can. It is becoming recognized that this burden is not graduated, like the income tax, according to ability to pay, and therefore that it levies a much heavier toll on the poor majority than on the rich minority. Many legislators who favor the bill admit and regret all these things. But they repeat the answer taught them by the business interests who control both parties, and by the Treasury Department, that it is necessary because the money must be obtained and there is no other way to get it.

Those who repeat this formula do so while they support a bill which places the rates on incomes at the relatively moderate level of 1924, rather than at either of the two higher levels which we maintained during the War and after it, or at the level now existing in Great Britain. They overlook the fact that the rates on inheritance taxes, while increased in the bill, are still far below those existing in other nations. They fail to mention that the proposed increase of the tax on corporate profits is only from 12 to 13 percent. We should be more impressed by the hard-boiled sincerity of the Democratic and Republican leaders if, before declaring the sales tax a disagreeable necessity, they had advocated more drastic increases in these other directions as a disagreeable necessity.

The argument that we could not get enough money in these directions is not valid as long as one admits that we could get more than we should under the rates written into the bill. It may be contended that even with very much higher rates on incomes, profits and inheritances, the budget could not be balanced in 1933. In that case it would be reasonable to argue for a less equitable form of tax as well. But the argument has never reached that stage, because the higher rates are not proposed in the bill or by the Treasury.

It is, incidentally, difficult to believe that the $550,000,000 which the sales tax is expected to yield would not be obtainable by sufficiently high rates in other taxes. In the depression year of 1930 the aggregate net income of those who had

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

net incomes over $5,000 was $10,198,000,000. Let us suppose, to be conservative in the extreme, that this will be cut in half in 1932. Still we should have to take an average of barely more than 10 percent of these incomes to collect the entire $550,000,000 which the sales tax is supposed to assure. That disregards the possibility of higher revenue from profits and inheritances. It disregards extra taxation in the lower brackets, or the possibility of lower exemptions to the income tax than in the pending bill. It overlooks the possibility that in 1932 net incomes will not be reduced by so great capital losses as those of 1930. Are we to believe that it is physically impossible to tax incomes to the extent of something less than 10 percent, in addition to the taxes prevailing in 1924? Even if an addition of 10 percent were levied equally on all brackets, it would mean that the lowest income subject to the tax would pay 12 percent as against the 20 percent now paid by those in the lowest bracket in Great Britain—which includes persons having much lower standards of living than those subject to income taxation in the United States. And of course it is hardly conceivable that the extra levy would have to be as much as 10 percent, or would be apportioned equally among all brackets.

Aside from the natural interest of the rich in paying as small taxes as possible, there are only two intellectually respectable arguments for not increasing the rates on incomes, profits and inheritances enough to raise any desired amount. They were both employed by Secretary Mellon to get taxes reduced before the depression. One is that rates which are too high do not bring so large a yield of revenue as rates which are lower. The other is that if we take too much money from the rich, we interfere with their ability to invest, and thus restrict industrial activity. It is true now, as it always was, that both these arguments cannot be valid at the same time. Either you get more money from the rich by higher rates, or you don't. If you do, these rates certainly do yield more. If you don't, then the capacity of the rich to invest is not restricted. The only conceivable adjustment between these two arguments is to suppose that while higher rates do yield more revenue in the present, the restriction of private investment which results hampers prosperity in the future, and that this in turn eventually restricts the yield because it reduces the earnings of capital. But advocates of low rates in the upper brackets usually do not bother to deal with the contradiction at all.

One of their arguments is that persons who have to pay higher income taxes are bound to find ways of evading the levy, no matter how ingenious we are in stopping the leaks. When legal avoidance becomes impossible, illegal evasion and deceit are employed. The attempt to escape bearing one's share of governmental expense has become a popular game among the richer Americans. If that, with the moderate rates proposed, we have reached the upper limit of what the income taxpayers can be made to pay, the necessary inferences are damaging in the extreme to our society. It is said that we face a national emergency equal to that of war. It is said that the prime necessity is to balance the budget, and that confidence in the government is the essential basis for confidence in anything else. If the government is allowed to drift toward insolvency, capitalism is doomed. Yet at the same time, we admit that those who are the chief beneficiaries of capitalism will employ trickery and deceit to avoid supporting the government which is essential to them. We admit that they will nullify the power and the law of that government in so far as it attempts to make them bear the extraordinary public burdens which arise from their failure to manage economic affairs with reasonable foresight. We then say that, because the rich will be dishonest and will decline to rally to the government which they chiefly control, the burden must be put on the poor, who cannot escape. It must be put, not merely on those who benefit less from the existing regime than those who now pay income taxes, but on those who actively suffer under it, those who cannot afford even to feed their children properly. If this is the example of morale which those who are supposed to lead our society offer to the rest, there is no avoiding the conclusion that it is rotten to the core.

As for the argument that if a higher income levy succeeded in getting more from the investing classes it would interfere with prosperity because it would restrict investment, surely that is absurd. Mr. Mellon's successive reductions of income-tax rates in the past obviously failed to maintain prosperity, in spite of enormous investments. Granted that new investment might be helpful now, would fear of having to pay taxes prevent it, if profits were in sight? Is the surplus of the investing classes now being put into circulation by investment in new enterprises? On the contrary, everyone admits that it is being hoarded in every conceivable way. But what the government takes in taxes is spent and helps to maintain activity. The government is engaged in a great campaign to end hoarding. The simplest way to end it is to tap the idle funds by taxation and governmental borrowing. The worst way to meet governmental costs is to take money from those who have to spend all they make in any case, to take it from the stream of money which is already in circulation. And that is just what a general sales tax does.

The new tax bill is bad social morality, bad economics, bad government. It is first-class evidence of the weakness of our ruling classes, their muddy thinking, their anti-social attitude. The victory which they might win by its passage would prove to be, in the long run, one more of those many deceitful and reckless acts which makes their ulti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Hindenburg Victory

THE German election has come to a temporary close with a great personal triumph for President Hindenburg, whose victory in the run-off election is practically certain. The historic personality of the old Field Marshal who, in the eyes of the masses, represents Germany's glorious past, undoubtedly contributed materially to this result. To many of those who opposed his election in 1925, he appears today as the lesser of two evils, particularly since his record has been, on the whole, less reactionary than was feared by his more democratic opponents at that time.

The press has interpreted the present campaign as a decisive struggle between democracy and fascism, but a closer appraisal of the factors involved shows that not one of the candidates truly represents a democratic outlook on fundamental political problems. Hitler, Düsterberg, Thälmann and their parties openly disavow democratic government. Hindenburg, of course, is frankly a monarchist and a nationalist. He was chosen as a standard bearer by the middle parties and the Social Democrats because he alone seemed to offer assurance of election over the growing National Socialist menace, and because he upholds the Weimar Constitution as the best way out of Germany's economic difficulties.

Has the Brüning government scored a victory? Let us take the present election figures for an analysis of probable developments in the coming Reichstag elections. A total of 37,660,377 votes was cast on March 13. Since the election law provides for one deputy for every 60,000 votes cast, a Reichstag elected on the basis of present figures would consist of 627 deputies, 314 of whom would constitute a majority. Hindenburg received a total of 18,661,736 votes, which would logically entitle him to almost a Reichstag majority. As a matter of fact, however, 1,657,757 votes must be deducted from the above figure as having been cast by followers of the German People's party and the Christian Social People's Federation (according to the 1930 returns for these parties). These groups, though they supported Hindenburg in this election, have voted consistently against the Brüning government and are members of the Harzburg "National (anti-Brüning) Opposition." The Brüning bloc could, therefore, count on not more than 283 deputies, the National Socialists on 186, the Communists on 82, the German National People's party (Hugenberg) on 42, and the German People's party and the Christian Social People's Federation on 26—altogether, a majority of 336 deputies. The present government would lack more than fifty additional votes for control.

The campaign for "democracy" was carried on in a most undemocratic fashion. The radio—in Germany a state institution—was placed solely at the disposal of the Hindenburg supporters. Air planes, milita[illegible] for Hindenburg. National and state office holders were officially warned to vote for Hindenburg, with the admonition that a vote for Hitler or Thälmann would be treason to the nation. Der Angriff, the organ of the National Socialists of Berlin, was suppressed during the most important week of the campaign, and other fascist and Communist papers met with the same fate. These coercive measures were reënforced by the clamor of the outside world, the threat of a French invasion and of financial inflation, should Hitler be elected. Yet, in spite of this worldwide opposition, the National Socialists have increased their national vote 78.2 percent over that of 1930. The Communists, although supported by the Socialist Workers' party and the two Communist opposition groups, increased their vote by only 400,000. The Hugenberg Nationalists, contrary to expectations, maintained their previous strength.

The insistent claim that the presidential election marks a turning point in Germany's political destinies and that democracy is henceforward assured, is premature, to say the least. It is almost certain that the Hindenburg victory cannot be repeated in the Prussian state elections which are to take place on April 24. Prussia is now ruled by a coalition government consisting of Social Democrats, Centrists and a representative of the State party, the Social Democrats holding the important ministries. The German People's party and several agrarian groups in the Prussian Landtag which were a part of the National Hindenburg "Front" are bitterly opposed to the Prussian coalition. On the basis of the figures of March 13, a new Prussian parliament would consist, in its majority, of anti-Brüning deputies. Moreover, since the Landtag elects the Prussian government, it can safely be predicted that by the end of April the Braun government will have ceased to exist. Consequently the Prussian delegation to the Reichsrat (the upper house of the German Republic) to be appointed by the new government, will be nationalistic, and will presumably change the composition of that body so radically as to make it impossible for the Brüning regime to function. A new Reichstag election will be the only alternative.

A few words should be said here concerning the Social Democratic party, which seems to have succeeded in bringing the bulk of its adherents into the Hindenburg fold. It is impossible to determine the number of Socialist votes cast for Hindenburg, but the state election held in Mecklenburg on the same day would indicate that this party's consistent support of the Brüning policies continues to cost it votes and influence among the laboring masses. In this state, in which the S.D.P. has at times been part of the government, it lost three deputies to the Landtag, while the Nazis increased their representation by eight and those of the Communists and Hugenberg Nationalists remained as heretofore. In Prussia, the coming election will likewise

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with National Socialists, giving the Hitlerites an important place in the Prussian government.

The German Socialists issued the appeal for Hindenburg with great reluctance. According to The New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Ernst Heilmann, chairman of the Social Democratic party group in the Prussian Diet, who became famous in 1915 by his declaration, "But I go to Hindenburg," advised his socialist listeners in a Berlin meeting "to drink a stiff glass of grog before going into the polling booth on Sunday," to give them courage to vote for the old Field Marshal. This sardonic reference to the change that the S.D.P. has undergone reflects the general feeling of its membership.

The reëlection of President Hindenburg, as we have said, is practically assured. But to assume that the fascist menace has been overcome and that peace and democracy will now reign in the German Republic is an optimistic delusion. The National Socialist movement has almost doubled its vote in the last two years, and will do still better on April 10. Fascism is not to be conquered by popular elections. It will flourish so long as it is nurtured by desperate economic and social conditions.

Europe and Stimson's Doctrine

THE Stimson doctrine, that the United States refuses to recognize situations created in violation of the obligations of the Kellogg Pact, continued last week to occupy the center of the international stage. The League Assembly endorsed the American position as regards Japan, and thereby took what may prove to be the most crucial step in its whole history. The Stimson policy was attacked by President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard on the extraordinary grounds that by unsettling international affairs it might lead to war—a position doubly surprising coming from one of the chief signatories of the petition to Congress which asked for an American boycott on Japan. Most interesting of all is the opinion expressed at Geneva, that the United States has at last accepted the policy of sanctions and at the same time has underwritten the treaties of 1919.

This argument is not so labeled, but must have come from the French. It holds that in refusing to recognize treaty violations by Japan and Manchuria, achieved by force, the United States has also set its face against any attempt to remake the map of Europe by force. It is also argued that the Stimson doctrine really amounts to the application of force and is therefore "a sanction." For, it is said, this policy will certainly lead in the long run to the severance of diplomatic relations, to the application of a financial embargo and possibly to even more strenuous measures. This is an ingenious argument and one in which there is certainly some merit. It is probably true that Secretary Stimson, writing in terms of the Far Eastern words might have in Europe. It is also true that at present, any attempt to rectify by force the injustices in the treaties of 1919 would lead to another disastrous, general war, and that the United States must inevitably be opposed to any such development. But while the Stimson doctrine does set up sanctions of a sort, they are very different from the sanctions proposed in the League Covenant, or demanded by those enthusiasts who wanted the United States to boycott Japan. The sanctions implied in the Stimson doctrine are ex post facto. They would arise little by little from the situation as created. There would be a minimum likelihood that they would result in war, whereas the League sanctions would have a maximum likelihood of this result.

As a matter of fact, the Stimson doctrine is already at work. The new Japanese-controlled state of Manchuria has announced to the world that it is in need of foreign loans. It is perfectly obvious, however, that it is not going to get them from the United States. It is equally difficult to see how such loans can be made by any of the countries in the League, in view of the declaration of the Assembly on March 11. This consequence results, not from a formal embargo of credit, but from the fact that a government maintained solely by the military force of one foreign country cannot be a good risk. Japan herself cannot spare the capital needed for the operations in Manchuria; indeed, she requires additional foreign capital on her own account, and will have an extremely hard time in getting it. It is quite possible that in the long run the Kellogg policy, if it is supported by all the Great Powers, may prove a better check on militaristic adventure than any of the cumbrous, unrealistic and at present disregarded machinery set up by the League. It is also possible, of course, that some one of the Great Powers, such as France, might disregard the Stimson policy and its endorsement by the League, and make loans to Japan which would keep her going for a time. That, however, is a risk which the world has to run; and it is a smaller one than those involved in any alternative thus far presented.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1932, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK ALVIN JOHNSON
E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES
R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brokers and Pioneers

THE ATTITUDES of the years after the War, before the depression had set in, already seem a long way off:

The attitude of the Menckenian gentleman, ironic, beer-loving and "civilized," living principally on the satisfaction of feeling superior to the broker and enjoying the debauchment of American life as a burlesque show; the attitude of old-American-stock smugness, with its drawing aloof from the rabble in the name of old Uncle Gilead Pilcher who was Governor of Connecticut or Grandfather Timothy Merrymount who was killed in the Civil War—though the *nouveaux riches* kept piling up so fast while the prosperity boom was on that it was becoming harder and harder to get one's aloofness properly recognized; the liberal attitude that American capitalism was going to show a new wonder to the world by gradually and comfortably socializing itself and that we should just have to respect and like it in the meantime, taking a great interest in Dwight W. Morrow and Owen D. Young; the attitude of trying to get a kick out of the sheer energy and size of American enterprises, irrespective of what they were aiming at; the attitude of proudly withdrawing and cultivating a refined sensibility or of losing oneself in abstruse intellectual pursuits—scholastic philosophy, symbolic logic or metaphysical physics; the attitude of letting oneself be carried along by the mad hilarity and tragedy of jazz, of living only for the excitement of the night; the attitude of keeping oneself disinfected with the feeble classicism-fascism of Humanism.

I have in one mood or another myself felt sympathetic toward all these different attitudes—with the single exception of Humanism; and they have all had their validity for certain people, for certain situations. Yet today they all look rather queer: they are no good in the present situation, and we can see that they were never very profound. We can see now that they were all merely attempts on the part of the more thoughtful Americans to reconcile themselves to a world dominated by salesmen and brokers—and they were all compromises with the salesman and the broker.

Mencken and Nathan laughed at the broker, but they justified the system which produced him and they got along with him very well, providing only he enjoyed George Moore and had pretensions to a taste in liquor; the jazz-age romantics spent his money as speedily and wildly as possible and forgot as completely as possible about the factory and the office; the old-American-stockers sniffed at him, but though they salved their consciences with sniffing, they were usually glad to get in on his good things; became vaguely resigned and couldn't find it in their hearts seriously to quarrel with him; the poets and philosophers hid from him—and the physicists got more and more mystical in the laboratories which his endowments had provided; and the Humanists labored in volume after volume to induce people to find in the Stock Exchange the dignity and harmony of the Parthenon.

II

Not that there is anything new about this state of things in America. Our thinking and our art have always tended to compromise—and hence to mediocrity. If Americans do not play an impressive part in the literature and science of the world, it is because they have only very rarely carried their ideas far enough.

Or rather, our artists and thinkers have tended to conform to one or the other of two imperfect types: the journalist with an element of genius whose own point of view is close to that of the middle-class world from which he comes and in which he easily finds a large public—the Mark Twain, the John Sargent, the William James; or the intense nonconformist who follows some special line of his own and cuts himself off from the general life altogether—the Herman Melville, the Albert Ryder, the Charles Peirce. The first kind of man suffers from the dilution or cheapening of his vein; the second, from his isolation. We are always feeling with the first kind that there ought to be more in them than there is; with the second—the Melville, the Ryder, the Poe, the Thoreau—that the minds they take us into, though of the first quality, are too narrow and too much turned in on themselves: their thought remains sharply alive, their color rich and deep, but they cannot fertilize or stain large areas. Each of them remains still more or less in his incommunicable cell. "Moby Dick," for example, fine as it is, is like going down the funnel of Dante's Inferno, with no Purgatory or Paradise to follow. And though it is undoubtedly a bracing experience to spend a day in the woods with Thoreau, the insistently self-righteous tone of the sage's preaching finally gets on our nerves and makes us wish he mixed more with his neighbors.

Because almost the whole development of America has taken place inside the bourgeois psychology. You saw it at its best at the end of the eighteenth century in the group of men who founded the Republic—the Jeffersons and Adamses and Franklins. But with the growth of our bourgeois institutions, a general cheapening of art and science took

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have written elsewhere of certain Europeans who were able to stand aside from the great capitalist-bourgeois complex and to study it profoundly and judge it—Karl Marx, Gustave Flaubert and Bernard Shaw. And if we compare with them their American counterparts, we shall be able to gauge the extent to which the American mind has been submerged by the capitalist wave which rolled across this continent.

The American Henry George, for example, really came very close to writing "Das Kapital." A poor printer in California during the fifties and sixties, he had begun to be struck by the same phenomena which Marx had observed in Europe and had begun to see in them similar implications, and he had brought to the writing of "Progress and Poverty" a similar passion and imagination. Like Marx, he had had the boldness to tackle en masse the bourgeois economists who had written of industry entirely from the point of view of capital and to assert that wealth was created by labor. Like Marx, he had come to realize that there were contradictions involved in modern society which were certain in the long run to wreck it if radical readjustments were not made. He diagnosed the corruption of public life and the growth of insanity and crime which were already plainly apparent in America by the end of the seventies as definite symptoms of decay. He foresaw the increasingly widening gulf between an owning and a dispossessed class and he described the economic depressions of his own time as the twitches which precede a paralytic stroke. He pointed out the desirability of socialism and warned society against an uprising of the masses. But his proposed method of achieving the one and averting the other was an eighteenth-century political reform which had been exploded by Voltaire: the tax on land values alone.

Though Henry George's picture of industrial life in America was almost as gloomy as those of Marx, he denied the fundamental conflict of interests between capital and labor and by directing his attack against real-estate owners exclusively, let the manufacturers out. Though in the first part of "Progress and Poverty" he insisted that wages were not advanced by capital but actually supplied by the products of labor, in the latter part he talked about industrial profits as values to which the capitalist had a clear title in contradistinction to the profits of rent. And thus himself partially sharing the assumptions of the society against which he was crusading, he never arrived at a thoroughgoing analysis of it and was able to have a more considerable success than would have been possible at that time for a Marxist. The American industrialists, whose withers were unwrung by his doctrine, in some cases lent him support and in 1886 it was found necessary to form a coalition against him to keep him from being elected mayor of New York. But as his ideas did not go so deep, they have not

And if we put certain American novelists beside Flaubert, we find that they fall short in a similar way. Henry James owed a good deal to Flaubert and had much in common with him on one of his sides. The pathos of Frédéric Moreau's long and desultory and frustrated love affair with Mme. Arnoux seems echoed in many novels of James—as also in those of Edith Wharton and all that genus. There is sometimes a little irony mixed with this pathos, but it is never the thoroughgoing irony of Flaubert. Frédéric Moreau is really the hero of most of James's novels, but James's attitude toward him is different from Flaubert's. You can see this difference very plainly if you compare certain kinds of scenes which recur in James's novels with scenes in "L'Education Sentimentale" from which James has evidently imitated them: those situations of a sensitive young man immersed in some kind of gathering or having a succession of meetings with various characters without being able in his innocence precisely to figure out what they are up to. The reader is able to divine that they are more worldly and unscrupulous persons than the hero and that they are talking over his head, acting behind his back. You have this pattern, as I say, both in Flaubert and in James; but the difference is that, whereas in James the young man is made wondering and wistful and is likely to turn out a pitiful victim, in Flaubert he is made to look like a fool for not understanding what is going on around him and is as ready to double-cross these other people who seem to him so inferior to himself as they are to double-cross him.

And in this difference between Flaubert's attitude toward Frédéric and James's attitude toward, say, the hero of "The Princess Cassamassima" is to be guessed, I believe, the real reason for James's peculiar resentment of Flaubert. Flaubert interested James deeply: they had in common that they were both trying to give dignity to the novel of modern middle-class life by bringing it to intense esthetic form. And James returned to Flaubert again and again, wrote several essays on him at different periods. But though he obviously can't help admiring Flaubert, he usually manages in the long run to belittle him—and he is especially invidious on the subject of "L'Education Sentimentale." His great complaint is that Flaubert's characters are so ignoble that they do not deserve to have so much art expended on them and that there must have been something basically wrong with Flaubert ever to have supposed that they did. James never seems to understand that Flaubert intends all his characters to be "middling" and that the greatness of his work arises from the fact that it constitutes a criticism of something bigger than they are. James praises the portrait of Mme. Arnoux: thank God at least, he exclaims, that here Flaubert was able to muster the good taste to deal delicately with a pure and fine-grained woman! He seems completely unaware that Mme. Arnoux is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—that the virtuous bourgeois wife with her inhibitions and superstitions is a part of the bigger thing that Flaubert is ridiculing, too. Henry James mistakes Mme. Arnoux for a refined portrait of an American lady and he is worried because Frédéric isn't a quietly vibrating young American. Yet at the same time he must have his uneasy suspicion that young Americans of that kind are being made fun of. I believe that James's antagonism to Flaubert is due primarily to the fact that Flaubert's criticism of the pusillanimity of the bourgeois has really touched James himself. James's later heroes are always regretting having lived and loved too meagerly; and James, who sees only them, makes them meagerly tragic. Whereas Flaubert, who sees Frédéric Moreau in relation to the vigil of Saint Anthony and the impacts of pagan armies, makes of his hero's recalling in middle age his first clumsy and frightened visit to a brothel as the best that life has had to offer him a damnation of a whole society.

As for Flaubert's satirical side, I don't know whether Sinclair Lewis has read or been influenced by him; but, as has often been remarked, "Main Street" presents a very close analogy to "Madame Bovary." The difference is again—beside the difference in esthetic quality—that whereas Flaubert sees all around Emma and assigns her to her place, Sinclair Lewis does not understand that his heroine is made of the same social stuff as the small-town shopkeepers whom she hates and that the America which he blames for her plight is only a part of a larger phenomenon.

As for Bernard Shaw, his American counterpart is Mencken. Mencken, too, has made a great success of abusing the bourgeoisie. The child of a line of German scholars, inhabiting a quiet Southern city with some intellectual life of its own, he has made the air of American journalism ring with the Teutonic vigor and humor of his prose. But his point of view in certain fundamental ways has remained almost identical with that of the age of triumphant American business in which he grew up. He is thus unable to see Andrew Undershaft objectively at the same time that he draughts his apologia, as Shaw was able to do. He has seen and denounced the ugliness, stupidity and corruption of bourgeois institutions; but he has attributed all the trouble to "democracy," never analyzing the economic structure. He has persisted in the faith of American capitalist laissez-faire that the best men always get to the top and that those who don't make good are weaklings. And he has been able to find in Nietzsche philosophical and poetical justification —ignoring Nietzsche's insistence, repeated by Shaw's Nietzschean heroes, that the superior man must not merely get to the top but serve the rest of his fellows when he gets there. How does Mencken reconcile his conviction that the best men always make their way and that the powerful and the rich invariably represent the best with his pessi-

cians are only the tools of the business men and the business men have arrived where they are through a process of natural selection which ensures the survival of the "superior man," why does Mencken rail against the politicians?

But he doesn't try to reconcile or explain. He can only go on having the same emotions, stuck in the same intellectual jam, content to rage and complain without hope. So that though he may move us, he can never get us any further because he cannot enlighten us as to what is wrong—except in so far as he presents in his own single person a walking capitalist contradiction.

III

We Americans have lived and breathed and had our whole national being in the world of the triumphant bourgeoisie. Behind our great capitalist society there lies for us but little tradition of a pre-capitalist civilization. Outside ourselves there are only the Indians, from whom we are separated by so many thousand years that, living side by side with them though we have been doing for several centuries, we are scarcely able even now to understand their institutions and point of view.

The life of the pioneer was, to be sure, something quite distinct from the life of the typical capitalist-dominated modern community: it was a way of escaping from the capitalist expansion which was absorbing the whole Western world. And what is best in our American tradition is our inheritance from this life of the frontier. That is why Walt Whitman, who seized it and expressed it, conveying its exhilaration and keeping clear of the bourgeois conventions which ruled the rest of American culture, is probably our greatest writer. He had a vision of a land of free men where all the trades and bloods were equal, where all the faculties and organs had scope—and he found a language for it outside the bourgeois books. It was as if he had made the earth again and seen that it was good.

But the actual progress of the Republic soon began to give him uneasiness. The frontier ran its course like a ripple on the land that breaks against the water. Henry George, in his own lifetime, had seen the earthly paradise of California transformed from a community of independent men adventuring in a new country with equal chances and rights, to a place where along with liveried carriages on the streets of San Francisco and yachts on San Francisco bay the unemployed wandered the streets ready for work at any wages because the mines and the timber lands were now in the hands of a few millionaires and where on enormous estates left uncultivated by their owners the blackened chimneys of settlers showed.

The day of the settler was brief. The great plant of the capitalist overtook him and included the whole country in its cage. And have not most of us born since 1890 grown up in the shadow of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its weight—so that we have respected it even when we resented it and felt ourselves weak in comparison with its power? Yet our society, for all its great buildings, its great feats of engineering, its great newspaper reputations, its great millionaires, has been socially a flimsy affair. For all its magnitude, built up so quickly on what had just before been a wilderness, it has not grown out of an older society and we haven't the moral and intellectual roots which in older nations serve to keep people's minds steady when social changes are taking place. We have only a varied assortment of individual traditions preserved from other nations and races which, as Americans, we have left behind, to remind us that the bourgeois world of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is not coextensive with the whole of human nature—and the memory of that brief period of freedom when we were independent men in a new country. It has been the instinct of that independence revolting against the processes which were throttling it which has put up some of our strongest fights against the capitalist in the past: Populism, the Single Tax, the I.W.W.—and there has been something of it even at the bottom of Jeffersonian agrarianism in the South. It is the principal thing outside the bourgeois psychology which we Americans as a people have to fall back on now—and the time has come when we shall have to make the most of whatever we have that we can lay hold of and raise ourselves out of this psychology so that we can see our society and deal with it. Capitalism has run its course and we have got to imagine something better.

So American intelligentsia—scientists, philosophers, artists, engineers—who have been weltering now for so long in a chaos of prostitutions and frustrations: that phase of human life is done! Stagger out of the big office, the big mill—look up and look through those barren walls—look beyond your useless bankrupt fields and pastures! Remember that discovery and freedom which you enjoyed for a little while—the discovery of humanity and the earth has only been begun!

These colossal cities, hard and dull, down whose shafts the sun has first reached us; these vast countrysides, dull and flat, where we have been lost on small rafts in a sea—the mind can disintegrate steel and stone as it can pump life into the desolate plains, and make them homes for human beings. But the mind must first remake the mind, taking down the old structures of thought which alone keep the others in place, as wrecking crews demolish old buildings. The mind must attack its own assumptions, relay its own foundations. And we Americans, though our intellectual tool-making has never been of the same quality as our mechanical, have perhaps after all an advantage in the fact that in the material field we are used to demolition and reconstruction. What we need now are engineers of ideas as drastic as our practical ones.

EDMUND WILSON.

Peace—by Pact or Covenant?

AS I WRITE at the close of the first week of March, a very different outcome for the Shanghai fighting may be envisaged. The talk about a truce and peace may come true. But it may also be true that Japan is repeating her previous tactics, and is drugging world sentiment into temporary quietude while preparing aggressive measures in the Yangtse basin. But whatever is going to be the outcome, there is great need that pacifists take stock of their attitude and come to a reasoned position toward their future action.

One reason why Japan has kept the world confused as much as it has succeeded in doing is because the very rapidity of her moves has kept public sentiment busily engaged with speculating about the meaning of each one separately, and has thereby prevented the formation of any settled unity of judgment about the course that best leads to lasting peace. Moreover, as I shall indicate later, this confusion (which has been such an asset to Japan) has been increased because of conflicting cross-currents in the means appealed to in behalf of peace.

by saying that I feared from the start that the Pact was prematurely adopted. For its power lies wholly in the moral force of the peoples behind it, and there was no adequate evidence that the education of the peoples regarding its meaning had been anything like adequately completed when the Pact was officially signed. The Pact should have been the conclusion of an irresistible public demand; to a considerable extent it was the termination of the maneuvers of diplomats. There has, therefore, always been the danger that official adoption of the outlawry idea would turn out to be an embalming of the idea rather than an embodiment of it.

No matter whether the Japanese have reached the end of their campaign or are just beginning to do for the whole Yangtse Valley what they have already done for Manchuria, the need is great to centralize public sentiment about the principle of outlawry. Prevailing feeling is fairly well represented by the saying that the Paris Pact did not prevent war; it only prevented a declaration of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever, material for serious consideration. It cannot be repeated too often that outlawry signifies the withdrawal of juridical status from the war *system,* not the outlawry of a nation which goes to war, whether with or, as has been the habit of Japan, without a declaration of war. The acceptance of outlawry in the Peace Pact of Paris thus gives an entirely novel status to her adventures in Manchuria and the Yangtse Valley. If there had been a state of war under the old regime, Japan's action would have been legally regularized. Even if she had been subjected to moral condemnation by some or many persons, her activities would have been in accord with the principle that war is the ultimate arbiter of legal international justice, the last court of juridical resort in the settlement of disputes.

Under the regime that preceded the Paris Pact, other nations would have been obliged to take official cognizance of the state of war. They would undoubtedly have done so by proclamations of neutrality. But popular sentiment of the different nations would have taken sides; commercial and financial interests would have moved in one direction or the other; the anti-Chinese antipathies of British Tories and the pro-Japanese sympathies of French diplomatists would have had surer occasion to express themselves, and, presumably, there would have been contrary movements in this country.

The history of the World War shows how precarious is the preservation of neutrality under modern conditions of intercourse. We can at least say that the juridical nonexistence of war has helped save other nations from the strain which would have occurred without the existence of the Peace Pact. Nor has the general absence of the war spirit in other countries and the failure so far to inoculate the peoples with war fever been due wholly to the memory of the last War. The Paris Pact has operated as a constant reminder that we have at least committed ourselves nominally to living in a different sort of a world. And there is some gain in the fact that Japan, instead of being engaged in sending abroad idealistic reasons as to why she is at war, has to content herself with explaining that she is not at war at all. Spontaneous ridicule is not the least effective among the moral forces of the world.

I have not yielded in what I have just said to the temptation, natural to one who believes strongly in the outlawry idea, to indulge in a Pollyanna justification of it. One may point to certain gains without holding that the Paris Pact has emerged with complete glory. Some months ago, Salmon O. Levinson, the original instigator of the outlawry movement, proposed what he termed a "peace sanction" in lieu of the sanctions of force. He proposed that the nations signing the Paris Pact should follow up their signature with an express declaration that all "exactions, territorial acquisitions or rights obtained by occupation or seizure by war, or under the menace of war, or in the presence of armed force, are null and void under the Pact of Paris." No general and concerted action in this direction has taken place. But a significant step has been taken. Secretary Stimson in his note of January 7 of this year (repeated in his letter to Senator Borah of February 24) said that our "government would not recognize any situation, treaty or agreement entered into in violation" of the Nine Power Pact and the Paris Pact, and went on to indicate (and virtually to invite other nations to say) that similar action by other nations would effectively bar any title obtained by pressure and treaty violation.

There is another passage in Secretary Stimson's letter which does not appear to have received the attention it merits. Speaking of the Far Eastern situation as it now exists, he says:

> It is not necessary in that connection to inquire into the causes of the controversy or attempt to apportion the blame between the two nations which are unhappily involved; for, regardless of cause or responsibility, it is clear beyond peradventure of a doubt that a situation has developed which cannot, under any circumstances, be reconciled with the obligations of the covenants of these two treaties.

Under the international law which obtained prior to the signing of the Paris Pact, diplomats and public opinion would have had no other alternative save to consider causes and to apportion blame. There has been, of course, considerable discussion attempting to perform these two tasks. But under the Pact of Paris it is irrelevant and immaterial. Every article discussing the illegal acts of China which gave provocation to Japan has only distracted attention from the one important fact, namely, that Japan was seeking redress by means which she in common with other nations had solemnly disavowed. There is nothing surprising in the fact that Japan has tried to fix the attention of the world on these matters of antecedent provocation. The fact that so many publicists have been misled into playing Japan's game only shows that the public's grasp on and belief in the Kellogg-Briand Pact is still lamentably superficial.

Still more lamentable, and for the reason that it indicates neglect of and lack of understanding of the Pact, is the fact that public sentiment on the whole has been more stirred by danger to American national life and property than it has been by Japan's flouting of the pledged word upon which the peace of the world must rest. To vast numbers there is something more dramatic, more appealing, in a threat of danger to an American life than there is in a threat to the solemn engagements into which the nations of the world have entered. The old ethic of national honor and defense of prestige still bulks largest in public imagination. There has developed as yet no dramatic identification between national honor and the international agreement to abandon all but pacific means of settling disputes. The fact that Secretary Stimson in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threat of building a big navy and of fortifying Far Eastern possessions is something which weakens the other appeal which has just been mentioned. It mixes an appeal to force with an appeal to observe the pledge to employ only pacific means.

The only conclusion to be drawn from the facts of the situation, both those indicative of the value of the Pact in an emergency and those unfavorable to its constructive power, is plain. Lovers of peace should concentrate attention upon the Peace Pact; they should deny themselves the use of all methods of agitation and appeal which are contrary to its letter and spirit. If this were done, the work of public education which was interrupted by the more or less premature official adoption of the Pact would be reundertaken and carried on more vigorously than before. In this case, the Far Eastern embroilment will strengthen the force of the Pact instead of weakening or perhaps destroying it. For the point to be kept steadily in mind is the permanent bearing of the Far Eastern conflict upon the peace machinery of the world. This effect is more important than any other phase of the present armed struggle. I would not yield to any one in sympathetic appreciation of the human tragedy enacted in and around Shanghai. But if we get so stirred up by the scene of death and destruction that we lose sight of its basic cause, the war system, we shall in the end only confer added force upon this system.

A further point is that effective action for peace has been confused and hampered because of diverse currents among the advocates of peace. The simple fact is that different machines in the world's peace machinery have got in one another's way and have thereby slowed down if not stalled the operation of the machinery. I would not be guilty of using the present situation to discredit the League of Nations. I believe that some of its inefficacy is due to the failure of our own government to coöperate heartily in the early stages of the Manchurian invasion. The appointment of General Dawes turned out to be an empty gesture and his conduct gave Japan an early understanding of its emptiness, upon which she at once acted. On the other hand, some American devotees of the League have used the present crisis to advance the cause of the League rather than to serve directly the cause of peace. Article Sixteen of the Covenant is, together with the connection of the League with the Versailles Treaty, the great obstacle to the adherence of the United States. But it is more than that; it is also a great cause of the failure of the moral judgment of the world to base its condemnation of Japan wholly upon her violation of the Paris Peace Pact. MacDonald called the punitive clauses of the Covenant "dead wood." They are worse; they are foci of infection with that dependence upon force which is the essence of the war system. That they are ineffective because they will not be set in motion, I other respect. They prevent the resolute and unanimous dependence of the nations of the world upon enlightened public judgment. That in the end is the strongest force there is; all treaties, including pledges to use the sanction of force and to resort to so-called international war, themselves depend finally upon nothing but the moral force of sentiment and opinion.

I plead then for three things: First, that the basic idea of the Paris Pact be put to the front and be kept there, and that all judgments and policies relating to the Far Eastern situation be based upon it, and upon it alone. Second, that the Pact be carried to its logical conclusion in a common statement of all nations signing the Pact that all demands, acquisitions, pretended rights, obtained in violation of it, are null and void. Third, that the force clauses of the League of Nations Covenant be abrogated so as to bring the Covenant into agreement with the Pact which was signed later, in order that the League influence reënforce that of the Peace Pact instead of working against it.

JOHN DEWEY.

Fire Flowers

Flowers of fire bloom as grand poppy leaves
reaching and eager out of the smokestacks
of Gary.

(What about that eight-hour day they was telling us about?)

The sprockets of purple flame, blazing their
criss-cross picture on the black print of
the night, are pretty, so pretty.

(How long ago was it they said they was going to give us that eight-hour day?)

The fire streaks up into the sky and breaks—
it is thousands of glass roses spreading and
shattering off into the black bowl of the sky
up over.

(That was just a lot of hooey about the eight-hour day, wasn't it?)

Here's a fire-white vase holding green stalks
of fire—it melts into crying chrysanthemums—
it fades to a heave of rolling smoke.

(You needn't say I said so but what they told us about that eight-hour day was just a plain goddam lie.)

Ai ai! the fire colors rise in the evening—
such oranges the smoke shovels! such bananas
on black shoulders! such alphabets of flame!
such mushrooms of gold and pearl! such lavender
ladders of smoke talk! such language!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chaos or Control

III: *We Learn from War*[1]

TO PROPOSALS that economic life be organized for collective purposes, it is customary for conservatives to answer that the task is beyond human capacity, or that, even if it could be done, it is something alien to the peculiar talents and values of America. These objectors forget that Americans, before the Russian Revolution, using their native wit and their domestic resources, once did a remarkable job of planning. Many of those who now advocate economic planning have been doing so, in one way or another, ever since the experiences of 1917-18, and mainly as result of the possibilities which those experiences suggested for better performance in times of peace.

This is a dangerous statement for anyone who believes in planning. It suggests to one with vivid memories of what happened during the War, that he wants such things as heatless Mondays, sugarless coffee, dollar-a-year men, useless wooden ships, Hog-Island confusion, an aircraft program which produces no airplanes, an artillery program which does not deliver a single gun in France, railroads accumulating a huge deficit and "undermaintained," big profits for meat packers, inflated wages, farmers held down to a minimum price for wheat and suffering from a broken promise about the price of pork, industries accumulating swollen surpluses.

There is no possibility of denying the fumbling, the mistakes, the occasional dishonesties, the annoyances, accompanying our industrial mobilization for war. But we cannot understand that experience without recognizing a number of striking facts.

We took about ten million men—or one-quarter of our gainfully occupied population—out of the production of goods and services useful in the ordinary life of peace. Some of these men were in the army, where they were engaged either in the destruction of life and property or in being trained for that destruction. The rest were occupied in equipping these men with the complicated and costly instruments of destruction, and all the other special material which they needed. Ten million of our ordinary productive forces not only had to be fed, clothed and housed as in peace, but themselves were engaged, directly or indirectly, in active destruction. This immense dislocation was achieved within a few months; was carried out while the rest of the population was sustained on a level higher, on the average, than ever before.

The lesson of this experience cannot be escaped. By a deliberate collective effort, a tremendous expansion of our production was possible. By a deliberate effort, an amazing transfer of industrial energy from certain types of production to other types could be made in a short time. If that military and industrial army had been mobilized, not to kill, burn and shatter, but to substitute garden cities for slums, to restore soil fertility and reforest our waste regions, to carry out flood control, to increase the necessities of life available for those in the lower-income groups, we could have achieved in a short time a large number of really desirable objectives. It is nonsense to say that there is any physical impossibility of doing for peace purposes the sort of thing we actually did for war purposes. There may be obstructions in our institutions, habits and desires, but not in our equipment, skill and intelligence. This is not to say, of course, that we could do the peacetime job in precisely the same way.

What was involved in the economic organization for war?

Before the War, we had an economic society proceeding in the habitual, unplanned, competitive way. Goods were produced in response to the demand of purchasers. If the demand for a given product rose faster than the supply, its price increased; this stimulated production on account of the larger profits which could be made. Supply and demand were adjusted—so far as they were adjusted at all—through the price and profit mechanism. Nobody had much idea as to the total effect of what was going on. There was no inventory of resources, of capacity or of demand; no program laid out for the future, no control of prices or profits. The persons or groups who had purchasing power commanded the resources of production in their own interest.

Into this society, before the United States entered the War, there was inserted, like a force pump, an extraordinary demand for the materials desired by the Allied armies and nations. Governmental purchasing agents came over with enormous credits to buy large quantities of customary goods and also large quantities of special goods which we had not previously been making.

Then the United States entered the War. In addition to meeting the growing demands of the Allies, our industry and man-power had to fill the huge demands of our own governmental agencies. These agencies had all the money they wanted to spend. The government financed them to the limit. But they had almost no preparation for the job of raising and equipping a gigantic modern army. Not

[1] This is the third of a series of five articles, which are condensed and adapted from chapters in a forthcoming book, entitled

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordered far more than they would need. They competed with one another for supplies which would not go around. They stepped on their own feet. Producers were pulled in every direction at once. Shortages developed everywhere—except in places where the need was not immediate. We had to make army cantonments, ships, tractors, tanks, guns, ammunition, clothing, and so on, to a total of thousands of items. And at the same time, men had to join the army. Something had to be done to subdue this planless waste. We had to arrange our demands on the one hand, and adjust the use of our resources to them on the other. This is what the economic war machinery was slowly designed for.

There was gradually developed an economic-planning system for the army, the navy and other great purchasers. These strove to work out a program in reasonable terms and to coördinate the various parts of it. Requirements were cleared daily through clearance committees in the War Industries Board, which would not allow orders to be placed unless the facilities for filling them were in sight. When it was necessary, on account of limited resources, to give priority to one type of demand over another type, a priorities committee in the Board decided which was to have the right of way. How far, for instance, should the available steel be allocated to ships, how far to guns, how far to railroad equipment? The most vital necessities of the War and the basic goods needed to sustain the civilian population were of course put first. Producing units, on the whole, accepted these priorities as a guide out of their confusion. When it was necessary to enforce priorities, the government did so through its control of railroad transportation or coal. It denied freight facilities or fuel to manufacturers who insisted on giving first place to goods not having priority status.

As a guide to clearance and priority, commodity sections in the War Industries Board kept constant tab on the capacities and existing production programs of the industries. They were in contact with committees representing the industries in question. Thus a rough production plan, not known by any one person at any particular time in its entirety, but worked out in countless details daily by many persons, was substituted for competitive demand and the planless adjustments of the price and profit system as the regulator of production. All this work was eventually headed up in the War Industries Board as the principal coördinator of war industries.

The Food Administration performed somewhat the same function for the food supply, coördinating the demands of the Allied governments and our own with those of the civilian populations arising through the ordinary channels of trade, matching demand against supply in the several kinds of foodstuffs, rationing where necessary, encouraging increase of output where necessary, working out essential substitutions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Fuel Administration took charge of the coal industry to see that it produced and shipped as efficiently as possible. It reduced many of the wastes of private enterprise, which often ships too much coal here and too little there, and ships it for greater distances than are necessary, in the competition for markets.

The Railroad Administration saw that the carrying capacity of all the railroads, considered as a national unit, was utilized to the best advantage. Rolling stock was pooled, and parceled out wherever necessary. Routes were changed to make them shorter and more economical. Terminals were unified. Instead of being run to the greater glory and profit of individual, competing companies, the railroads were run to provide as efficient as possible a national system of transportation.

The Shipping Board took charge of shipping with the same end in view. It mobilized the cargo space and the existing port facilities to fill the tremendous demand for ocean transportation as well as it could be filled. These activities, though less spectacular than the attempt to produce new ships through the Emergency Fleet Corporation, were fully as useful.

There was built up a system of federal employment exchanges to economize the supply of labor, and to direct it where it was most needed. A national machinery for the adjustment of wages, hours and conditions strove to deal with these matters rationally rather than allowing them to be decided on the basis of economic conflict alone. In order that the machinery might work, the right of labor to organize was, in many cases, implicitly recognized.

Price-fixing agencies, in the War Industries Board, the Food and Fuel Administrations and elsewhere, steered a course between two equally important objectives. One was to prevent such high prices for goods which were greatly in demand that the War would be unduly obstructed. The other was to set prices high enough so that industry, which was of course still operated on a profit-making basis, would be stimulated to the necessary productive effort. It was known that under war conditions great profits would be made, but the excess-profits tax was devised to convey some of these windfalls back to the government. As a device for social justice, the price-fixing and profit-limiting activity left much to be desired, but as a means of regulating production for war purposes it was moderately successful.

We entered the War in April, 1917; the Armistice was signed in November, 1918. While some of the preliminary steps were taken before our declaration of war, and the machine was not fully demobilized until 1919 and later, nevertheless this gigantic task of economic organization was performed mainly in the eighteen months of hostilities. Is there any wonder that there was a good deal of confusion in its operation? The marvel is that, by and large, it did the necessary job, that it saved us

What does the war experience teach us about the possibility of planning in peace? Is it true, as many have said, that we cannot organize our economic machinery for collective purposes unless we have to raise an army to fight an enemy?

One reason why it is supposed that we cannot do so is that, under the stress of war, the national government is permitted to do many things which would be constitutionally difficult in peacetime. The President, as Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy, has almost dictatorial powers. There is truth in this observation, and yet the economic organization of the War was by no means based upon mere political dictatorship. Little that was done had to be enforced by edict and threat of penalty. But there were other more important circumstances making possible wartime planning which do not ordinarily exist in peace. It will be useful to analyze these in order to see how, if at all, we can create substitutes for them when we are not at war.

The real compulsion, at bottom, was that furnished by the situation in which we found ourselves. Having decided to fight a war, to raise an army, to supply it and transport it, there were certain things which, we painfully discovered, had to be done to achieve that end. Understanding of these necessities brought compliance on the part of many persons which would not have been accorded to the exercise of arbitrary or capricious force. When an obstinate objection was met, the procedure followed was to explain the relevance of the proposed measures to the national purpose, and to ask the objector to face the responsibility of obstructing that purpose. This was the negative usefulness of a known and declared end. Positively, it created in many an enthusiasm which made obstacles easier to overcome.

To supplement this means of bringing compliance there was the economic force furnished by the fact that so much purchasing power was concentrated in the hands of governments. A buying monopoly, whether it is public or private, is always in a position to dictate to sellers who are not subject to an equal degree of combination. If the government said, "Of the various things I am ordering, I want this first, that second and that third," the seller had good reason to agree. Likewise the government, as purchaser, was in a strong position to say, "You must supply me with essentials before you supply other, less important customers with nonessentials." These two types of economic dictation, which are practised in some degree in ordinary business life, become nothing less than the ability to enforce planning, when raised to a national scale. Of course the governmental purchasing power was in a favorable bargaining position with regard to price, as well as with regard to many minutiae of direction. The control that was exercised over industry was based, therefore, not primarily on constitutional political power, but on the economic power which naturally lies in the hand of a gigantic purchaser. No such concentration of purchasing power normally exists in peace.

The fact that governments were purchasing, and were purchasing to prosecute a war, likewise laid the reasoning basis for a plan. Because army and navy staffs were able to find out approximately what was needed, and the order in which it was needed, it became possible to draw up production schedules, to correlate them with one another, to rank the demands in an order of importance. There were objective criteria of judgment which could be used as the basis of decisions about production. These criteria were not easy to discover, and were not easy to apply, but they did exist. When our usual economic institutions are operating in peace, there is no single agency to specify and correlate demands.

Finally, there was a situation which is peculiarly important when we are considering planning as a method of avoiding depression and increasing the general standard of life. Depressions are characterized by a general lack of purchasing power; even in moderately prosperous periods there are usually idle plants and machinery which cannot be kept busy by the existing market demand. But, during the War, our industrial plant was operating at high pressure; there was almost no unemployment. Why did this happen? Merely because production was centrally adjusted? By no means. It was because governments were pouring a great stream of money into the markets. In times of peace there is almost never enough money seeking goods so that our productive plant works at full capacity. The sole exceptions are periods of speculative boom or inflation which shortly collapse into depression. That is one of the economic mysteries of an uncontrolled system. Perhaps the most important difference between the war economy and the peace economy was the presence in the former of abundant and insistent purchasing power.

The procedure of war finance has often been explained. Governments, which had to spend enormous sums, acquired them in two ways. One was by increase of taxation. But taxes were not raised sufficiently to provide anywhere near enough public funds. The other way was by borrowing. Now the curious fact about this borrowing was that it did not merely transfer purchasing power from the lender to the borrower; it actually increased the purchasing power of lenders as well as that of borrowers. In a sense, the government created the funds which it borrowed.

If Jones borrows five dollars from Smith, Smith has five dollars less to spend and Jones has five dollars more; the total of purchasing power is not increased. If Jones borrows five hundred dollars from a bank, the bank does not have to get from Smith or anybody else the five hundred dollars which it lends, provided its reserves are more than sufficient. In that case, total purchasing power is increased by the amount of Jones's loans. (Increases of credit of course have precisely the same effect on purchasing power as increases of dollar bills in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

received the amount in currency, and draws against it either to pay someone by check, or to get cash.) A general increase of credit by borrowing from banks often occurs in peacetime, and when it occurs, we usually have business revival or prosperity—purchasing power is increasing and thus is making a better market for goods.

In a roundabout way, the government increased purchasing power just as if it had used the printing presses to turn out huge quantities of paper money, and had spent this money. It is highly important not to forget the dual economic role of government in our planning: while with one hand it was increasing the ability of industry to produce, and thus to pour out goods and employ labor, it was with the other hand creating and handing out the money which enabled factories and farms to finance their production, pay the wages to the labor employed and increase the incomes of all others concerned. And workers, farmers, employers and the rest came back into the markets with their increased incomes to buy the things which the government itself did not require.

Economists will be quick to point out that there is a catch in this process which makes it inapplicable to a long-time economic program. They will admit, of course, that a general increase in purchasing power by expansion of credit stimulates industrial activity, whether in war or in peace. But they will warn us that this course, if continued, leads to what is called inflation, which in turn leads to a financial and industrial crisis. If purchasing power is increased more rapidly than the ability to produce, prices will rise (as they did, all over the world, during the War). The faster prices rise, the more individuals and governments will be induced to borrow. This in turn leads to more price increases.

This might be thought to lead to ever increasing prosperity. But it does not do so, as the world has since learned, to its sorrow. All prices and all incomes do not advance at the same rate, in these circumstances. If they did, no damage would be done. But government income from taxes does not expand so rapidly as government expenses grow, and thus governments drift toward insolvency. Wages cannot be raised as rapidly as retail prices; thus wage earners' purchasing power is eventually decreased. Rents change tardily, and so landlords suffer. Bond yields increase a little, but hardly enough to make any difference to those dependent on income from this type of investment. Retail prices rise more slowly than wholesale or factory prices. Factory prices rise more slowly than prices of raw materials. Although total purchasing power is increasing, its distribution radically changes. Certain large classes lose purchasing power, while other classes gain it with miraculous rapidity. It is channeled off to owners of, and speculators in, raw materials and productive establishments. The sign of an era of inflation is a rapid growth in profits.

What kills inflation-prosperity in the end is this: government, which begins by increasing the purchasing power in its hands, ends by being unable to collect enough to meet its obligations. In cases where inflation is not caused by governmental fiscal policy, but simply by expansion of commercial or investment credit, the apple cart is upset by the fact that profits are collected faster than they can be spent, while those who do not share in profits must perforce restrict their own expenditures; so markets for goods collapse. This is an oversimplified account of what happens, which overlooks many complicating factors, but it is close enough to the facts to serve the purpose of the present argument. The argument is to the effect that a government cannot maintain prosperity indefinitely, whether in war or in peace, by the simple expedient of inflating purchasing power.

This objection cannot be left, however, without pinning on it at once two important qualifications. There is no valid theoretical reason why, under proper policy and control, we need bob up and down between inflation and deflation. It will be remembered that the main characteristics of inflation are:

1. An increase of purchasing power *more rapid* than the increase of production and trade;
2. The fact that the resulting increase in prices and money incomes is *uneven*.

If a government could increase purchasing power just enough to keep us all busy, but no more, and if it exercised sufficient control over prices and incomes to prevent the channeling off of an excess of purchasing power into profits, depression need not result from a controlled stimulation of purchasing power. At least, it looks that way, before the experiment has ever been tried anywhere except (possibly) in Russia. If the War had continued, and our government had perfected its machinery of price control, wage adjustment and excess-profits taxes, it is quite possible that it might have learned how to finance its purchases without increasing its current expenses more than its current income, and how to increases the general store of purchasing power as rapidly as production and trade expanded, but no more rapidly.

To sum up the lessons from our war planning, then, if we are to plan successfully for peace, we must establish the following four basic conditions:

1. We must have an objective which can arouse general loyalty and enthusiasm.
2. We must have an objective which is capable of being so concretely defined that it can decide questions as to how much we need to produce and in what order of importance the requirements are to be arranged.
3. We must have some means of mobilizing purchasing power—at least a substantial portion of it.
4. We must have some controlled means of increasing purchasing power. We must increase it enough but not too much, and we must distribute the increase in the right places.

George Soule

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Jamming Through the Sales Tax—First Round to Roosevelt—Garnering Delegates—Wet Feet and Herbert

BEFORE this Democratic tax bill gets through the Senate, some of its pristine beauty will be spoiled and a great many harsh things be said about it—for that matter, they are being said already. On the other side of the Capitol, it may not have easier sailing; in fact, although the plan was to jam it through in short order, it may not pass without delay and substantial modification. Of course, the noisy attempt of the Wets to amend it by imposing a tax on beer will not get anywhere, and nobody knows this better than Mr. La Guardia and his Wet friends. The Volstead Act would have to be amended before there could be any beer tax, and there is no chance whatever of modifying that sacred statute at this session.

None the less, the effort of the beer-tax brigade is good propaganda, and I think the Wets used excellent political sense in going to it. What they accomplish, of course, is to drive home the fact that prohibition deprives the government of a vast revenue and that we would not be in anything like the deep fiscal hole we now so painfully occupy if it were not for the Eighteenth Amendment, the Volstead Act and the farcical efforts to enforce the unenforcible. However, with the Democratic leaders supported by the administration, there certainly will be a determined struggle to jam the bill through the House without serious changes, though there will be a considerable number of hot-for-the-record speeches.

It is in the Senate the real fight will be made, not only on the sales tax but on the income-tax rates. The progressives will try to raise the rates on the higher brackets and decrease them on incomes under $10,000. Special efforts will be made to raise the 40-percent assessment on incomes above $100,000, despite the stock argument of the Treasury Department and the possessors of large fortunes that this is the saturation point; the law of diminishing returns begins to operate, they say, if the figure is pushed above 40 percent. It is extremely doubtful, however, that the progressive fight will be successful along this line, or that there will be a further increase in the estate and gift taxes. The combination of administration support and Democratic leadership may be sufficient to enact the measure without much alteration. However, you never can tell about a tax or a tariff bill, and there is ample opportunity here for senatorial log-rolling and back-scratching.

Further, it is no secret that at the beginning the Senate and the House Democrats were not of one mind about the bill. Certain Democratic Senators felt that it was not good party policy to take over the job of pulling the Treasury out of the hole into which Republican management had plunged it, and they favored no such drastic measure as has been produced. But the Big Business advisers of the party, who are in complete control of the committee machinery, bore down so hard that the House leadership promptly succumbed to the "balance the budget" pleas, and indeed went farther along the administration lines than the ad- sales tax was an inevitable proposal, simply because the business interests argued that there was no other feasible way to get the money.

The main concern was to "get the money," and the Ways and Means Committee, originally hostile to the sales-tax idea, swung completely round—or perhaps it is more accurate to say, was swung. The progressives in the Senate will oppose the sales-tax feature, which is the backbone of the bill, but there may be no acceptable alternative. The bill will go through, but not without some amendments, some compromises and some kicks that will impair its appearance and diminish the effectiveness of its defense in the campaign. It may have been sound policy for the Democrats to ignore political considerations in dealing with a huge Treasury deficit under a Republican administration, but some of their leaders are considerably disgruntled. It is a little difficult for them to bear lightly the commendation of the administration fiscal officials, who would have proposed the sales tax in the beginning if they had not been afraid of the popular reaction. Of course they are for it. Why wouldn't they be?

Roosevelt's victory over Smith in the New Hampshire primaries does not appear to have changed the situation so far as the struggle for the Democratic presidential nomination is concerned. For one thing, it was not unexpected. Roosevelt had the advantage of being early in the field, and the more influential party leaders were already committed to him before the filing of the Smith slate. New Hampshire gives him only eight convention delegates and they had long been counted in the Roosevelt column. None the less, he had to have them for the psychological effect. A defeat in the first primary, and in a state consistently claimed for him, would have pretty well ruined his prospects. The rush away from him by the high-siders would have been immediate and unanimous. But winning New Hampshire does not advance him very far; it is too small a state to be a test.

The big test, as I have pointed out before, will come in Pennsylvania on April 26. There seventy-six votes are at stake. Nearly a year ago the smooth Mr. Guffey publicly pledged sixty-six of them to Roosevelt. Despite the effrontery of such a promise by a boss in a state where the voters are supposed to choose the delegates, it was the basis for a good deal of Roosevelt's lead. It made him look a winner. Had he been allowed to get the state through default, he would have run away with the nomination. But there is a real fight there now for Smith delegates. Both sides appear confident; at this stage of the proceedings no one can foresee the result, which is largely a matter of leadership strength. I suppose that so far as possible the Pinchot administration will help Roosevelt, while Vare's organization in Philadelphia will give what aid it can to Smith's forces. It will be rather an unsavory contest, but it may be decisive. If Roosevelt wins there, the effort to stop him should collapse. On the other hand, if he should get less than a majority of those seventy-six delegates, the odds will be against him—particularly as the rumor still persists that Boss Curry is determined to take the New York delegation to Chicago unpledged. That Smith will carry Massachusetts seems to be generally conceded but

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as would a Smith victory in Pennsylvania. That will be the first real battle. New Hampshire was interesting but not decisive. The fight will proceed as before.

In the meantime, the supporters of other aspirants are engaged in the effort to build their heroes up into a position where, if and when the break from Roosevelt comes, they will be the inheritors of his delegates. The most interesting and vigorous boom at present is that for Speaker Garner, the enthusiasm of whose supporters blinds them, I think, to certain basic facts that will interfere with his nomination should Roosevelt become impossible. In that event it is clear that Smith and the forces that look to him for leadership will at least have a veto power if not the ability to dictate the candidate. Notwithstanding the friendly encouragement now given Garner's candidacy, it seems hardly likely that Smith will approve the nomination of a candidate who comes from one of the Southern states which bolted the Smith ticket in 1928, a candidate who was originally sponsored by his implacable enemy, William Randolph Hearst, and is now strongly endorsed by the despised William G. McAdoo. That the much talked-of Smith following could be or would be delivered to such a candidate seems out of the question. Yet the Garner boom, aside from that of Roosevelt, is the most vigorous of any and has apparently the best chance of developing in the convention.

My reports from California are to the effect that the four Hearst newspapers in that state, combined with the McAdoo following and the practical political direction of John B. Elliott, have the astute Dockweiler, Roosevelt's local manager, fairly well on the run, and that the betting out there now is slightly against Roosevelt's winning the state. To carry New Hampshire against Smith and lose California to Garner would balance the Roosevelt candidacy on the wrong side of the ledger. But what a combination for a candidate—Hearst and McAdoo! It isn't quite so funny as Jim Watson's eulogies of Hoover, but it must be admitted that it is a bit unusual.

Speaking of Hoover, Washington observers are again all keyed up over the idea that before the convention he will make some sort of statement or take some sort of position on prohibition which in some way will keep the Wet Republicans inside the Republican fold after the ticket is named. There have been so many of these reports about Mr. Hoover and they have turned out to be so completely unfounded that I am skeptical about this one. However, it is undoubtedly true that more pressure is being brought to bear on him by the Wets than ever before.

It comes from New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Ohio. I am told that the two members of his Cabinet in whose political judgment he has most confidence—Postmaster Walter F. Brown and Secretary of the Treasury Ogden L. Mills—are pushing him hard in the Wet direction, insisting that an unequivocal Dry position means that in the larger Eastern states—particularly in New York—the odds will be horribly against him. Even more potent, I should think, would be the obvious fact that the heaviest Republican campaign contributors are Wet, and a number of them are so Wet that they have already indicated a lor to take. Why is it that young English maidens and youths, who are brought up, we are told, on rice pudding,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the candidate and the platform are Dry. However, despite the force of these facts, I think the likelihood of the President's shifting his position, whatever that position may be, is not very great. It means a bitter fight in the convention and a discouraged set of leaders in the East, but then they are discouraged anyhow.

Washington. T. R. B.

Return and Exhibition

PEOPLE who saw Miss Laurette Taylor both in "Humoresque," with its story of the Jewish mother and her little son's violin, and in "Peg o' My Heart," with its charm, tenderness and impish spirits, will appreciate all the more what she does now, after five years' absence from the stage, in Barrie's "Alice Sit-by-the-Fire." The old poignancy is implied securely and profoundly, and the charm and spirit and tenderness are still there, with something of distinction added. Everybody knows the story of this Barrie piece of thirty years ago. The mere frame of it is that Colonel Grey and his lady, a great belle in army society, return from India to live in England on the pension of a retired officer; her determination is to win the love of her children, kept in healthy England all this time. The daughter has been going to too many problem plays, and seeing her mother's light manner, what with kissing a man friend and promising to call on him, she decides to save her by going herself to the young man's rooms. The solution as to both the daughter and son is solved by Alice's achieving the point where both children think they are protecting her, as she is subdued into middle age.

There remains only to speak of all the humor and deep tenderness, the lovely transitions from pathos to whim to comic strokes scarcely to be detected though wholly sure-fire, in Miss Taylor's performance. In the second act especially, the best in the play, some of her lines were read with a quality elusive, smiling, witty and lovely, to be found in no other actress. Throughout the piece at her best moments Miss Taylor's playing was like that. I do not mean to say that it seemed the greatest performance I ever saw or to go into a kind of seidletz hysterics to make my point; I mean merely to say that it had a characteristic of seeming beyond contrivance and a sort of changing rhythm of translucence rarely to be seen.

This performance in the leading role of Barrie's comedy —more a lyric farce perhaps—was rendered in the first act three times as difficult for Miss Taylor by the fact that up to her entrance the long scene had been left in the hands of two young actors who went hammering away at it, punching every point, forcing, carrying still further the forcing natural to Barrie. Mr. Maurey Tuckerman as the young son was about as arch as it is possible to be, and often embarrassed you for both himself and the author. Miss Peg Entwhistle as Amy, the daughter, with a far more important part in the story and with what seemed endless pages of dialogue to render, was sometimes fair; her personal quality, a matter of casting, was good. But the reading tempo, the conscious archness and period quaintness made her now and again a great hurdle for Miss Tay-

health and control in the nursery, as soon as they are let into the drawing-room turn out to be the most affected little exhibitionists imaginable, or at least on the stage they are so, full of the most arrant and tedious periodicity, ancient or modern? Mr. Charles Dalton as the colonel was excellent.

One is naturally interested in knowing how this Barrie piece may seem after so many years. Such a decision is vastly hampered by such playing. Barrie in the first act of "Alice Sit-by-the-Fire" promises as you attend him at the Playhouse to be a bit too thick to stand, what with the stage tricks, the whimsy, sly jokes and shameless coquetry carried so brazenly as to put you out of all countenance; as for me I was ashamed to look my neighbors in the eye. A part of this remains true, but not to a devastating degree, even in that first act. The truth is that the playing of Barrie comedy has already become a very hard problem, as shaky almost as the right handling of Congreve or Sheridan. The right direction for such writing as this is to try for some innocent stream, as it were, of playing, in which stream the points, jokes, antitheses, the whimsies, the obviousness and so on, could take their place easily and in a spirit more or less natural to the whole. Once you established a current and plane for such scenes, everything might bob in and out as it should, though even at that a score of cuts in the first act could be wisely made, out of sheer stage mercy. Miss Taylor herself might have taught these other players something of the right method. In all her part there was scarcely a line, however tricky or forced it might seem done wrong, that did not fall into a right and happy place and help toward the needed witty and lovely tone. As a matter of fact, I should say that, with a few cuts, "Alice Sit-by-the-Fire," instead of being so trying and almost hopelessly slight, has even stock-company possibilities. Played as sentimental farce, with a rattling tempo for the trick lines and a due stress on the genuine human content, "Alice Sit-by-the-Fire" might go well enough. On the whole, it is Barrie's fault, much of it; his combination of inspiration, coquetry and shrewdness makes trouble.

In the one-act play, "The Old Lady Shows Her Medals," nobody at all was very good. Miss Taylor was better than the rest, but she began on too drab, beaten and ashy a plane to give the play its full chance of humor and pathos. Such a faded wreck as she portrayed would never have invented such fancies as choosing a son or sending cakes in a society lady's name and so on. By such a treatment the play—a very fine one, beyond most of Barrie—was all wizened up; what we got was only tragic, dismal and ruined instead of bonny, impish, shy and heart-breaking.

An absence last year prevented me from seeing some of Mr. Robert Edmond Jones's most important work, the great marionettes for Stravinsky's "Oedipus," for instance. But much of his recent work I have seen, and this leads me to remark at the start, apropos of his exhibition at the Bourgeois Galleries, upon the theatre designer's handicap in such a venture. Nothing could illustrate more clearly the difference between the art of visual design in the theatre and that of the stage itself. Nothing could illustrate more clearly the difference between the art of visual design in the theatre and that of the stage itself. I think his work, at its best, comes to be so impalpable, have before it can become art, even one art in becoming another. A scene that has been very successful in the theatre may lend itself poorly toward a drawing or sketch for it; and a brilliant or decorative drawing may represent what was an ineffective stage setting.

It is necessary to see Mr. Jones's exhibition, though equally necessary not to judge him as a theatre artist by it. Any of the costume sketches for the Theatre Guild "Much Ado About Nothing," which never came off, would make charming decoration. The sketch for "The Jailor's Wench," that chamber of witty shadows, and for the sculptor's studio in D'Annunzio's "La Gioconda," numbers three and thirty-nine in the exhibition, are beautiful designs, beautiful and subtle pictures to own. I can easily believe that these sketches surpass any carrying out of them in the theatre. On the other hand, the design for the Ark scene in "The Green Pastures" makes an amusing little drawing, crisp enough, but nothing to the drollery and delight of the stage version of it. The "Sunset" for "Wozzek," though it might be a stage setting very rich and haunting, with all the dark values of the foreground, the long red suspensions of the sky, makes only a little painting with black at the bottom and beyond it something that is too near the usual triteness.

The fantasy and threat, the angles and circles, the chiaroscuro, the startling whites, in the Serenade Scene for Gounod's "Faust" seem implicit in the admirable sketch. The drawings for the halls and chambers of Lusignan Castle, for "Yolanda of Cyprus," in broad washes of color have a strange and diverse power put through them. On one wall of the gallery hangs a small sketch, number twelve, done in line and half-tone that looks quite fine, very crisp and decorative. But it of all the designs shows most the gap between the design and the setting. You would not know that the setting taken from this drawing was that scene in "The Green Pastures" of the children of Israel filing past in the wilderness, Moses too near his death to go on with them, his prayer and so on. What a scene that was! The color of the costumes, that dust or ocher, the tone of the sky, the figure of Moses; it was all great exalted style, austere and rich taste, with something of Tintoretto's grand audacity and poetry. That such magnificence in the theatre can pass away is only a corollary to the fact that it can happen there.

I have thought a great deal about the work of this artist and through many seasons. Apart from other qualities and aspects of his, one that has grown to be of great importance to me is the process by which he creates. For the artist, in his highest moments, intrusive corporeal reality—the actual objects, the scene—is diluted and subtilized until it becomes the picture, the dream. This is the point at which most artists stop. Their picture is created, is now in pigment, actual and complete. In an artist like Mr. Robert Edmond Jones, the picture has not at this point become actual; it is a form that exists as yet only within him. This form then, in its turn, loses its reality and becomes mere symbol, a sheer going forward of the mind, pure spirit. A true and fresh reality has thus appeared for him; and for it he creates its form. Through this process,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

A Victory for Crisp County

SIR: In my article, "Crisp County Carries On," in your issue of February 24, I set out the fact that the story about the alleged failure of the Crisp County Power Plant arose out of the attempt of a local banker, one of his directors and a debtor to the bank, all three of them members of the commission, to sell the plant to the Georgia Power Company without first consulting the people.

Word has come that at a county election on February 26 the banker and his director were defeated for reëlection by a vote of more than two to one. The term of the debtor to the bank ends next year and the people are waiting for the election. Democracy, it seems, is not *always* a failure.

Washington, D. C. JUDSON KING.

Paxton Hibben's Posthumous Work

SIR: It is both delightful and interesting to read John Dos Passos' "A Hoosier Quixote" in The New Republic of January 27. Your esteemed contributor, however, while enumerating Paxton Hibben's works, omits his last book, "The Peerless Leader: William Jennings Bryan." Though this work had to be completed by C. Hartley Grattan owing to the untimely death of Hibben, due credit should be given to him for having written an excellent life of the Great Commoner.

Urbana, Ill. A. O. SARKISSIAN.

Economic Planning and Control

SIR: The pamphlet on "Long Range Planning" was received with interest and some curiosity. To regulate industry in the interest of the consumer while preserving the legal rights and advantages of the capitalist would result in the happy condition that Communism, Bolshevism and the other figures used to throw scares into the American public would no longer have any meaning or advantage. But almost on the first page of the pamphlet the writers express their doubt whether the scheme could be put over, and, further, whether it would work if it were put over. And these doubts seem to increase as the plan is developed. The fact is, under the present economic system, if capital is to be attracted to industry, uncontrolled profits are a necessity and, under any modification of that system, the same rule will necessarily apply.

After the large expenditures and enormous amount of ground work which would be required even to reach a basis from which the Plan could be attempted—all of which is possible and probably should be done in any case—we arrive at the proposed operation of the system. The facts are there, costs, quantities required, distribution arrangements, everything taken into account if we consider only the mass-production producers and omit "bootleg" producers who, unless I miss my guess, would spring up like mushrooms, unless, of course, state or federal regulation put such parasites out of business. Anyone with $500 to $5,000 would be attracted to such a market with a controlled output and fixed prices—the small capitalist's paradise. Then what about the small manufacturers who are already established? We are told that they should amalgamate. I know of five small businesses in one line, who employ about fifty men. If these were amalgamated, probably thirty men would be sufficient. Twenty men are laid off, perhaps three small capitalists are "bought out." These three have the capital, the twenty men out of work are available. Under any system which retained a vestige of our present laws and social arrangements could these people be restrained from going into business? Not for a minute, unless the present economic system was entirely abolished and a social order of an entirely different nature substituted for it.

One feature of the Subcommittee is that hours should be public accountant, I can assure the committee that the present tendency to reduce wages is not, as may be supposed, to take advantage of a cheaper labor market, but, in all the cases I have investigated, wages are cut because of absolute financial necessity if the employer himself is to stay in business at all. That the Subcommittee has performed a useful public service is not to be doubted, but the service seems to have been in a direction which the Subcommittee neither desired nor expected, in that they have shown the impossibility of long-range planning on a national scale except by an entire reversal of our present economic system, supported as it is by a complete and well considered legal scheme of control on behalf of vested interests.

Vancouver, British Columbia. HERBERT E. TURTLE.

Is War Inevitable?

SIR: "Do you as a psychologist hold that there are present in human nature ineradicable, instinctive factors that make war between nations inevitable?" To that question, submitted to more than five hundred members of the American Psychological Association, Professor John M. Fletcher of Tulane University has received 345 answers in the distinct form of "No," with only eleven marked "Yes" and twenty-two inconclusive or indeterminate. He has just completed such a poll and given the results with his interpretation in a paper before our local Institute of International Affairs, which has just completed its first annual session with a program on the general subject of reduction of armaments. This paper seemed to be the most significant feature of our successful series of meetings and we are planning to have it reproduced and circulated, for this answer to the proverbial human-nature-inevitability explanation of war should be put before a wider group than psychological specialists or our local Institute membership.

H. C. NIXON, Secretary,
New Orleans, La. Institute of International Affairs.

The Conviction of M. N. Roy

SIR: International interest and attention has been attracted by the arrest and recent conviction of Manabendra Nath Roy, Indian Communist leader, who was sentenced to twelve years' transportation by the Anglo-Indian government on the charge of "waging war against the King."

The savageness of the sentence, as well as the circumstances of the trial itself—held on a seven-year-old charge within the confines of the Cawnpore jail under stringent judicial censorship—goes to prove that the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy regards the small but growing band of Indian Communists as a greater threat to the security of the British Raj than the more numerous followers of Mr. Gandhi.

The trial and conviction of M. N. Roy is in reality the trial and conviction of Communist agitation and organization in India, as well as of the fundamental rights of freedom of speech, press and assembly. Prosecutions of Communists in India have been few but spectacular. The Cawnpore Conspiracy case of 1924, of which the present trial was but a continuation, and the Meerut Conspiracy case, are outstanding examples of the determined effort to stamp out the spread of Communist doctrine in India.

Mr. Roy was tried, not for any overt act against the Anglo-Indian government, but for his organizational activities, speeches and writings, which have been legally construed as "conspiracy" to overthrow the King's government in India.

Because of what he stigmatized as the prejudiced attitude of the court and discriminations practised against him as a prisoner under trial, Mr. Roy withdrew from all participation in the case, refused to continue his defense and allowed the court to pass sentence unchallenged. In an endeavor to obtain a fair and impartial hearing, the case has been appealed to the High Court at Allahabad and will there be heard.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Indian Trade Union Congress, the Communist Opposition and other organizations, including the International Committee for Political Prisoners in New York, have issued protests and collected funds in his behalf.

American contributions to his defense fund may be sent through The Workers' Age, 228 Second Avenue, New York City.

Auburn, Calif. SANTI DEIR.

The Rococo Governor

SIR: Wayne Gard has probably come much closer to the real Alfalfa Bill, the man and his ideas [The New Republic, February 17], than have other writers for national publications. There are, however, a few points Mr. Gard has overlooked or minimized.

First, whether or not the rococo Governor of Oklahoma strikes intelligent readers as a clown, he should at least be respected for his straightforward, native sincerity and honesty. There is no superficiality about him. He is he. And I present that such an individual is becoming a rarity in a nation of sham and false-front nationalism—Babbitt culture.

Politically, Governor Murray is an anachronism. He speaks for a rural United States when it is vividly apparent to the most ordinary observer that the face of American civilization has changed a long while back from agriculture to intense industrialization. The machine habits and customs of the large cities are being taken up by Middletown. There is no doubt that the Sage of Tishomingo can well represent his particular group—the farmers, oil workers and small business men. But his ability to cope with the ramifications of a highly complex industrial system—the huge motor car and manufacturing industries with entirely urban problems—is, I daresay, obviously lacking.

Some say he couldn't do worse than the Great Engineer. Maybe so.

DEMOCRAT.

Oklahoma City, Okla.

What Do Liberals Hope for?

SIR: My reading of the Wilson-Chase discussion in The New Republic suggests the following excerpts from William Kay Wallace's book, "The Passing of Politics":

> Liberalism may be termed an effort to reform existing institutions which are growing senile. It is a remedy offered when social institutions are no longer suited to actual requirements. . . . It is at best a futile doctrine, a sort of social anesthetic. . . . It must, however, be noted that liberal movements attract men of high personal worth, and of natural conservative tendencies, who represent to themselves that they are on the side of the new order, when in point of fact they do more than their so-called conservative opponents to delay its advent.

In illustration of his statements, Mr. Wallace remarks that "we have Roosevelt (T. R.) attempting to found a Progressive party and let a breath of fresh air into the old system." I wonder if Mr. Wallace might not say, were he writing today: "We now have men of the type of John Dewey and Oswald Garrison Villard trying to start another political party for the purpose of saving an economic system to which we are indebted for this tragedy of unemployment." A party which proposes "to restore the idealism of American democracy and return government to the mass of the citizens" suggests a group of men with faces turned toward the past and proposing—in the words of Joseph K. Hart, "old answers to problems that no longer exist."

WILLIAM THURSTON BROWN.

Menlo Park, Calif.

SIR: The way this Wilson-Chase controversy impresses me, an uneducated onlooker, is this: Stuart Chase has been "dissecting the industrial structure" for almost twenty years and says he will continue doing so until he dies. As I understand it, he makes his living doing so. His article reads as though dictated or written from a comfortable office. Edmund Wilson's article reads as though he has recently been in Harlan, Kentucky (I see by the papers that he has) that he has seen unemployment . . . are matters which cannot wait. They should have been prevented. Any woman who has had the experience of raising a family knows the advance planning necessary as the different situations arise in a growing household.

Stuart Chase and The New Republic read as if they have lots of time to wait—as if written from comfortable and assured quarters, but Edmund Wilson sounds impatient—as though he was actually seeing what is taking place in our America today.

ROSE ISAAK.

San Francisco, Calif.

Grover Cleveland's Letters

SIR: Arrangements are being made for an authorized and complete edition of the letters of Grover Cleveland. Numerous letters by Mr. Cleveland are known to be in private hands throughout the country. We earnestly request all persons holding them to send either the originals or careful copies to the editor of the collection, Professor Allan Nevins, Columbia University, New York City. If originals are sent they will be transcribed and returned immediately.

JOHN H. FINLEY, President,
Grover Cleveland Birthplace Memorial Association.
George Foster Peabody, President,
David Robinson, Secretary,
Grover Cleveland Association.

New York City.

A Spokesman for China

SIR: May I suggest to the American public a new spokesman for China, The China Review, soon to be published in this country by a group of Chinese students and some American friends of China? The only aim of the publication is to present China to the American public in an impartial and friendly way. Any inquiry may be directed to 200 Varick Street, tenth floor, New York City.

KAU WU.

Columbia University, New York City.

From California

SIR: May one who can claim to be without Los Angeleanings and unafflicted with Califantiasis offer a few helpful hints for Mr. Wilson's guidance? It seems Mr. Wilson has gone too far afield with his talents. Why doesn't he look out of the West Twenty-first Street windows upon the all-in-a-heap big megopolis of Manhattan? I am certain it would respond to the Wilsomnia formula with even fruitier results than Nuestra Pueblo of the West.

I suggest he begin with the sheeny-shiny chromium-domium tip-tops of the ozzy snozzy Cry-out-loud Building and the empty-umpty one-hundred-and-whatnot storied (don't check that figure: the builders lost count themselves above the eighty-seventh!) State of Depression Building. . . . And for bawdiness!—Why, oh why, does he neglect that great big Maggy Raw Hill Building—the original limehouse both by day and by night!

With the Grandest Centralist place on earth to pick on, why should he ever bother with the Señora de Los Angeles? When he could work with not only the Grand Central Terminal and the Grand Central Palace, but the Grand Central Park all filled with —let's avoid that—and a Grand Central Concourse; while every switchboard operator, all dressed down in an evening gown at nine in the morning, is a Grand Central Something.

And with his remarkable eye for bathrooms, how does he come to overlook the lascivious lavatory luxury of those Park-payment apartments with their booful view right across the court into somebody else's bledroom. And, of course, he must have an idea or two about the sootably *moderne* repent houses, and the chicken-liveried adore men who are Manhattan's secret standing army, in this city where every goof hasn't a cent to his name, but gets by with a (closed on Fifth Avenue) Dobbs hat over an engraved letterhead. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here Are Liberals

Adventurous Americans, edited by Devere Allen. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 346 pages. $3.

LIBERALISM is under fire. Here, then, is a gallery of liberals to admire or to shoot at, as suits one's mood. Devere Allen, formerly editor of The World Tomorrow and now on the staff of The Nation, has induced friends and associates of the subjects to write brief anonymous biographical sketches of the following contemporary American personages:

> Oswald Garrison Villard, Oliver Wendell Holmes, John A. Lapp, Margaret Sanger, Norman Thomas, John Haynes Holmes, A. J. Muste, Judah L. Magnes, John Dewey, Jane Addams, Roger Baldwin, Carrie Chapman Catt, Paul Douglas, Burghardt Du Bois, Sherwood Eddy, William P. Hapgood, Sidney Hillman, Francis J. McConnell, Scott Nearing, Vida D. Scudder, John Nevin Sayre, Paul Jones, B. Charney Vladek, Grace Abbott.

Note that eight of these are preachers or ex-preachers. When a respectable middle-class preacher goes Christian, that's news; it is also adventure and liberalism. The evidence further indicates that fourteen of these liberals came from well-to-do or wealthy homes. Liberalism tends to be a middle-class and upper-class privilege; a condescension, a patronage, a liaison service between exploiter and exploited. In general, proletarians can't afford to be liberal. They climb the ladder of capitalist conformity if they can; most of them vote for Herbert Hoover and William Green. They revolt, for the most part, only when, as at this moment in Kentucky, it becomes apparent that they might as well starve above ground as in the mines.

Liberalism is of course an unsatisfactory word, whether used as a compliment or an epithet. It is more useful to look hard at the liberals themselves. Most, if not all, of these able, sensitive and gallant men and women are genuinely searching for truth, reality and decency in social relations, and honestly striving to bring these things to birth. Some of them are wholly committed to the destiny of the working class which they serve. One of them, Justice Holmes, is scarcely a liberal at all, but an intellectual aristocrat and a skeptic. Liberals are people, valuable people, who can and do contribute importantly to any revolutionary process. A first-class skeptic like Justice Holmes also contributes for the reason that his philosophic clarity achieves an almost ideal disinterestedness.

The anonymous sketch of Justice Holmes is one of the best in the volume. It integrates and confirms the scattered evidence of the Justice's published opinions and other writings, so that this much, at least, seems clear: the nonagenarian Justice is, first, a pre-Marxian evolutionist; second, he is not an individualist. His concern is for the society, the race, the civilization, and he even appears to accept the class struggle as the method of social evolution. "Justice," for Holmes, is a kind of Darwinian freedom for the experiments of the life-force. As an ex-army officer, a gentleman and a Darwinian, therefore, he has been umpiring the class struggle during a half-century of incomparably distinguished service on the bench. It is worth remembering that this undemobilized old soldier believes in force. Obviously his service in the Civil War was for Holmes a spiritual purgation which served to fix and define his essentially harsh and unsentimental philosophy. Perhaps, who made him a Marxian and a radical—never a liberal. He has always been, in fact, the despair of liberals—he is forever stuffing this sort of evolutionary candor into their pipes and telling them to smoke it:

> The fact is that legislation in this country, as well as elsewhere, is empirical. It is necessarily made the means by which a body, having the power, puts burdens which are disagreeable to them on the shoulders of somebody else. Communism would no more get rid of the difficulty than any other system, unless it limited or put a stop to the propagation of the species. And it may be doubted whether that solution would not be as disagreeable as any other.

One pauses longest at the portrait of the Justice both because of his commanding intellectual stature, and because the others, being mostly men and women of action, are comparatively less interesting. For the most part, they are sustained by attitudes, temperaments, emotions—not by clear and rounded philosophies.

For example, Scott Nearing, ex-Socialist, ex-Communist, incorrigible teacher and incorrigible radical, is a temperamental individualist and a puritan ascetic. Not even The Daily Worker, I believe, has thus far tried to jam him into its "social fascist" category.

Oswald Garrison Villard is a temperamental tribune, an advocate of lost causes who enjoys calling himself a failure, who is not without self-knowledge and who would quite conceivably be somewhat disconcerted by the actual overthrow of the class (his own class) whose iniquities he denounces: a prime "social fascist," barbecued almost daily by the Communists, indubitably honest and able, indubitably functional in the revolutionary process.

Here is Roger Baldwin, pacifist, philosophic anarchist and director of the Civil Liberties Union, impartially dragging class-conscious Communists and beaten-unconscious Negroes out of jail; fighting in court and out, not for Holmes's evolutionary freedom, but for an individual and social freedom which is essentially mystical; secretly whispering to himself, no doubt, "a pox on both your houses." Is Baldwin useful to the revolutionary cause? Well, revolutionists function more effectively out of jail than in it.

With Baldwin on the board of the Civil Liberties Union sits Norman Thomas. He also sits on all the other boards you can think of. In odd moments he is the Socialist candidate for President of the United States, for mayor of New York and what not. He is in the class struggle up to his neck all the time, is needed there, and stays there—often when noisier but less intrepid combatants have left conveniently for the country. His Marxian revisionism seems temperamental rather than logical—he is an ex-preacher and a pacifist; often his critique blurs off into ministerial vocables, although recently it cut sharply through the current rationalizations of capitalist "planning." Possibly the depression is hardening him. Certainly it seems silly to discount his value in the revolutionary process.

Here are Carrie Chapman Catt, Margaret Sanger, Jane Addams, Vida D. Scudder, Grace Abbott. The first two are embodied obsessions of astonishing power, fully as effective in the field of action as any of the men. Of the five, Miss Abbott seems to approximate most closely the gifts of the social engineer on which the future is likely to lean most heavily.

Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and Charney Vladek of The Forward are transplanted legacies from the 1905 Russian revolution; A. J. Muste is

ACCESSIBLE TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defined power philosophies; they are social engineers rather than liberals. So is William P. Hapgood, who is revealed by his anonymous biographer as perhaps the most interesting of the Hapgood brothers. He and his coöperatively owned and managed Columbia Conserve Company appear to have approximately solved, within the capitalist framework, some of the management problems with which the Russians are now struggling. And he is not a liberal if one may judge from his enraged comment when some Middle Western Babbitt called him a "Christian gentleman." "That," said Hapgood, "was disgusting. I would rather be called anything else except a scab."

Adventurous Americans: an interesting gallery, with some important omissions. Where, for example, are William Z. Foster and Robert Minor? The reviewer would cheerfully have swapped half a dozen ministers for either of them, if only on the score of actual adventurousness.

But was this not intended by the editor as a liberal gallery? Probably it was. It must be said, however, that only about half these people, and these the least interesting, stay in their liberal frames to be shot at. The others—those whose shadows lean forward into the future rather than backward into the past—are scarcely liberals at all. One is a skeptic. The others—peace to The Daily Worker—are radicals to the extent that they accept the radical social objective—a collectively owned and operated society—and are realistic and unsentimental in evaluating and using available means to that end. Certainly they are functional in the revolutionary process, and no amount of communist excommunication will stop them. Finally, even the liberals have their radical moments, and their uses for radicalism.

JAMES RORTY.

Finesse of Mind

The United States in World Affairs, 1931, by Walter Lippmann in collaboration with William O. Scroggs. New York: Harper and Brothers. 375 pages. $3.

THE AUTHORS describe their volume as the first of a "series which the Council on Foreign Relations proposes to publish annually giving an account of American foreign relations during the preceding year"—that is to say, the congressional year. Their account is from the viewpoint of the causes and course of the world depression, and the emphasis is such that the volume might have been entitled, "The World Affairs Which Affected the United States in 1931."

The volume begins with a survey of the attitude of the United States toward the depression. Was the depression temporary? Could it be expected to pass in the United States before Europe showed signs of recovery, or would recovery have to take place elsewhere before American conditions improved? Opinions are marshaled on both sides. The record of prolonged optimism is set down. There follows a careful analysis of the decline in production, prices and international trade, and the shrinkage of foreign financing. The abnormal gold movements are clearly depicted. The fiscal developments and political revolutions in Latin and South American countries are explained. We are then given an illuminating summary of the attempts that were made during the year to deal with certain basic commodities—wheat, sugar, coffee, oil, copper, nitrates, tin and silver. These attempts—save in the case of sugar—were largely unsuccessful. By the middle of 1931 developments in Europe were serious: the Kreditanstalt customs proposal, and the German banking crisis of June. These resulted in the Hoover moratorium. There follow chapters which deal with the development of the British crisis and the abandonment of the gold standard, the withdrawals of gold from the United States in October, 1931, and the Hoover-Laval conversations. The two concluding chapters treat American collaboration with the League with particular reference to disarmament and Manchuria.

As this summary suggests, the volume is devoted largely to the economics (and the resulting politics) of the world crisis. The authors have taken highly complicated problems and have done an admirable job of compression and interpretation. The discussion, for example, of the reparations and intergovernmental debt situation, with tables showing the out and in payments for all the countries concerned, is a marvel of lucid analysis. And, as one would expect, every page bears the impress of Mr. Walter Lippmann's felicitous and trenchant style. Some readers, however, may think it legitimate to raise two questions.

Are there, in the first place, phases of American foreign relations during the year which have been understressed? Twenty pages, for example, are given over to an interesting account of the fiscal difficulties of, and political upheavals in, countries to the south of the United States; but the authors say little of the controversy over recognition policy or Secretary Stimson's important statement on our intervention policy. The Permanent Court of International Justice is mentioned only in connection with its decision in the Austro-German customs-union case. Perhaps there was nothing more to say in view of Mr. Hoover's half-hearted suggestions that the Senate act, and the refusal of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to report the protocol. But some readers may consider that President Hoover's indifference is an important phase of American foreign relations. And the statement that in October the American government "consciously decided to acknowledge and pursue a policy of collaboration" with Europe is simply put and not argued.

In the second place, Mr. Lippmann's history is particularly interesting because, always illuminating in analysis, it so carefully avoids meting out any judgment. It most deftly walks a straight and narrow tightrope without inclining toward praise or blame. Was the Hoover moratorium proposal made maladroitly? Should the President have taken advantage of the wave of approval to get prompt and unconditional ratification by Congress? Was the government wise to think it of importance (apparently) that the Council permit Mr. Prentiss Gilbert to sit at its table instead of not at its table? Should it have been indifferent to putting up a front of this kind and have concentrated, instead, on coming to a solid agreement with the League in respect to policy? I confess to a lurking suspicion that Mr. Lippmann may occasionally have his tongue in his cheek, but this tongue in the cheek (to mix the metaphor) is, I fear, caviar to the general. In short, this survey of "American Foreign Relations" is a brilliant, interesting news story. During the year many millions of words fit to print have been given to us in matutinal doses. Mr. Lippmann presents the first of an annual condensation of the millions to, say, sixty thousand, and the sixty thousand words, as I have suggested, are carefully selected and put together.

Lord Morley somewhere quotes a critic of Guicciardini who declared that "in politics compromise may often be an excellent course; but in a history what we want are clear-

LICENSED TO UMI ONLY
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Like Guicciardini, Mr. Lippmann does not venture judgments. And since, stylistically, the book is literature, he may quote to me Renan's opinion that "it is the mark of finesse of mind not to come to a conclusion."

LINDSAY ROGERS.

Enemy Alien

Time Stood Still, by Paul Cohen-Portheim. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 235 pages. $3.

DURING the Great War, when every government was assiduously rounding up enemy aliens and tucking them away in internment camps where they could not disrupt the forces of justice and truth for which each nation was fighting, Mr. Paul Cohen-Portheim, the author of the present volume, was arrested in England. At the time of his arrest he was engaged in the harmless occupation of designing costumes for a performance of "Carmen." However, Mr. Cohen-Portheim was a Hun, the "Lusitania" had just been sunk and Mr. Asquith, to the cheers of Parliament, which evidently appreciated the spontaneous charity motivating the decision, had announced that the government was planning to "intern or segregate all enemy aliens for their own safety." So the author of "Time Stood Still" was forced to forget "Carmen" until the War ended and, after packing up his belongings, was marched off with several thousand other " 'Uns and biby killers" to an internment camp, where Mr. Asquith's government ensured their safety by cutting them off from the world with a ten-foot fence of barbed wire.

It was not a pleasant camp. The food consisted largely of frozen potatoes, the mattresses were made of straw, men fought over the privilege of earning a ha'penny by polishing shoes, buckets were used for all the rudimentary needs, and homosexuality gave every promise of blossoming into full flower. The author, however, did not stay for long in his first camp; for that innate delicacy which prevents the English from ever forcing a gentleman, even a German gentleman, to rub shoulders with his social inferiors, led the government to transfer Mr. Cohen-Portheim (a small income placed him among the élite) to a gentlemen's internment camp at Wakefield. Here things were ordered better. The enemy aliens lived by twos or threes in little huts, there was a canteen where they could purchase various delicacies, haberdashers came up occasionally from London to supply them with plus-fours, they were permitted to give plays and practise music, and they were even allowed to get drunk, provided they got drunk like gentlemen. In fact, life was very free and easy there, except that a barbed-wire fence prevented them from walking in one straight line for as long and as far as they pleased.

This major restriction cannot be said to have worked a particular hardship on the majority of the inmates. Most of them belonged to the middle classes; and the fear of adventure, initiative and imagination—during the three and a half years that Cohen-Portheim was interned, there was only one attempt at escape—imprisoned them more strictly than barbed wire or walls. Over the camp there hung a lethal atmosphere emanating from the drab, orderly, monotonous, stifling qualities of the middle class, an atmosphere which was created not so much by prison rules and discipline as by the numbed instincts and minds of the prisoners themselves.

It was in this torpid and oppressive air, more deadly to the human spirit than war itself, that Cohen-Portheim proud, and though it is easy to minimize his struggles when one remembers that across the Channel from his prison men were being ripped to pieces by shrapnel or choked to death by gas, it is petty to do so. For the war which the author describes, though of a different sort, is of as great an interest.

Whether Cohen-Portheim came out victor or vanquished it is difficult to say. He was inherently a mystic: his mind turned in upon itself, and he found an escape from prison through Blavatsky, spiritism and the philosophy of the East. His book traces this development. Though it cannot be compared in sweep and energy with E. E. Cummings' "Enormous Room," its pyschological aspects add much to the library of prison literature.

SLATER BROWN.

Raw Leaf

Tobacco Road, by Erskine Caldwell. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

"TOBACCO ROAD" is the story of a family of Georgia crackers, their serfdom, slow starvation and economic and social stupefaction. Erskine Caldwell has caught with phonographic accuracy the illiterate and repetitive gibberish which reveals the seedy background, the scant hopes and the ineluctable vassalage of these poor whites. He is a much easier writer than William Faulkner or Elizabeth Madox Roberts. Without tortuous effort, he can chronicle simple statements of fact.

The Lesters live in a leaky, broken-down shack on a sandy, recalcitrant and neglected farm. Most of the day Jeeter Lester, the father, sits around meditatively mumbling over his hunger, his worthless blackjack wood and his prospects, hoping that when he dies he won't be buried in his overalls. His old woman, Ada, is always pining for a silk dress and some boxes of snuff. She wants the snuff to keep her mind off food, and the silk dress for her burial.

There have been seventeen Lester kids, at least one of whom is illegitimate, besides some other farm urchins in the vicinity which Jeeter claims must be his. Most of them have casually left home at different times, without ever bothering to tell Jeeter or Ada of their intentions or their destination. Besides the parents, Dude, who is sixteen and has never gone to school, and Ella May, who has a harelip, still live there. The grandmother, Jeeter's mother, is also about the place, and they wish she were dead so that there would be more crackers and fat-back for themselves. The land, like all the property around there, has passed into the hands of absentee landlords. However, still clinging to the soil, rooted to the barren farms by a superstitious fear of the industrial cities and mill towns, these American muzhiks wait and pray for succor and a year of pentecost which never comes.

The novel opens on a warm February day. Lov Bensey, the son-in-law of Jeeter, is coming up Tobacco Road carrying a gunnysack of turnips. Almost a year ago Jeeter had traded in his twelve-year-old daughter, Pearl, to Lov for a week's wages, seven dollars, and some odds and ends. Lov complains that he hasn't been getting the benefits of a wife, for Pearl has slept on the pallet on the floor ever since their marriage. Jeeter, whose eyes have completely passed over into the gunnysack, promises to talk to Pearl if Lov will give him those bright gargantuan turnips. Failing to make him agree to this, Jeeter hits him over the head with a stick, and while the others hold Lov down,

LICENSED TO YBP NOTICE ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are incidents and passages in the book which evoke the grim cupidity and astringent humor of the peasants in "La Terre." The marriage of Sister Bessie, a female preacher and Holy Roller, to sixteen-year-old Dude, has this same Zolaesque texture. And the episode in which Sister Bessie and Dude kneel down in prayer in a motor-car showroom before the automobile she has just purchased is Middletown in fantastic bas-relief.

In one of the Scandinavian countries or in Russia, I believe, "Tobacco Road" would be hailed as something of a literary event. Here the chances are that it will be quietly buried like "The Enormous Room" and other unclean documents. Not until Mr. Caldwell has learned to make poverty, hunger and sex something that can be nostalgically mistaken for art rather than truth will his writings be widely praised—at least that is one reader's guess.

EDWARD DAHLBERG.

The Old Enemy

Witchcraft, Magic and Alchemy, by Grillot de Givry. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 395 pages, illustrated. $10.

POINTING out the fact that no work exists which deals comprehensively with the secret sciences of the past in Europe, M. de Givry has entered the field with the advantages of a sound and unpedantic scholarship, a good style and an imposing quantity of illustrations and manuscripts reproduced from the originals. In the same field there is, to be sure, Jules Bois' valuable "Le Satanisme et la Magie," but the latter limits itself pretty much to the subject of witchcraft alone, is out of print in France and has never been translated into English. M. de Givry has produced what amounts to an original work, a book for scholars and connoisseurs, but by no means for them alone.

For the uninitiated, this volume is a tour through the dim plains and gloomy Brocken landscapes of a superstition from which the Occident is only commencing to emerge. With clarity and a certain wit, the author has revealed the mass of folklore and pseudo-science long shrouded under the credulous fears of orthodox religion. One is bound to admit that the black magic of the past had a certain savor painfully absent from the Los Angeles magic of the twentieth century. If the adepts of black art who lived two hundred years ago are no longer taken very seriously, the practitioners of chiromancy, cartomancy, astrology and clairvoyance are still reaping fat rewards, and Mrs. Evangeline Adams has been consecrated by the radio as though she were Dr. Cadman or Cardinal Hayes. Turning to the illuminated pages of "Witchcraft, Magic and Alchemy," we find philters of love and death, compacts with Satan, the odd fashions of demons and demoniacs, dead-raisings and ghost-writings, precursors of Spiritualism, horoscopes and philosophers' stones, alchemists and cabbalists—to say nothing of a sympathetic frog in a green velvet jacket with bells, which reminds one of the so-whimsical creations of Mr. A. A. Milne and recalls that other odd Apparition which appeared to John Aubrey *circa* 1670 and "being demanded whether a good Spirit or bad, returned no answer, but disappeared with a curious Perfume and a most melodious Twang."

First among the considerations suggested by this book is the almost inevitable link between Satanism and Christianity. Certain modern theorists, like Margaret Murray, believe the former to have been a perverted remnant of the one that these demoniac powers of darkness are simply the externalizations of human necessities repressed by the impact of Christianity upon the antique world. With the suppression of the pagan gods, pleasure became sin, beauty became destruction and the animal and amiable Pan figured as the Goat God of the Sabbath. This, or something like it, would be the serious opinion of such a High Church divine as the Reverend Montague Summers, who has singularly combined the editing of Restoration comedies with the writing of vast and credulous tomes on witchcraft in western Europe.

Out of this reversal of the roles of beauty and terror crept forth the exaggerated sense of sin—an aspect of Puritanism and a true product of that decadence which overtakes a culture when the pleasure principle receives a too exclusive attention. To say that, from the psychiatric standpoint, this book is partially a history of the perversion suggested above, might be to depart too widely from its content and aim, yet it is undeniable that such base superstitions as devil worship and black magic are most clearly understood when considered as the ugly reversals of factors in human life which are highly salutary when consciously realized and controlled.

CUTHBERT WRIGHT.

Book Notes

BIOGRAPHY

MAXIM GORKY AND HIS RUSSIA, by Alexander Kaun. *New York: Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith. 620 pages. $5.*

Mr. Kaun makes no pretensions to having written a critical biography. He has gathered up such threads of Gorky's life as are available in the Russian writer's autobiographical and fictional works and has worked them into a comprehensive pattern which has a beginning, a middle and an end. He has reënforced his rich material with facts recorded by contemporaries, and has had the benefit of daily conversations with Gorky at Capo di Sorrento. The earlier chapters, dealing with childhood and youth, are the more attractive to the reader in quest of biographical "thrills"; what Gorky has endured seems incredible. The later chapters deal, for the most part, with his revolutionary activities; his relations with Lenin, begun in the early nineties, are set forth in detail. Altogether this is an adequate performance in which nothing of value is omitted.

RETURN TO YESTERDAY, by Ford Madox Ford. *New York: Liveright, Inc. 417 pages. $4.*

There is a good deal more in this autobiography of Mr. Ford's than can conceivably be interesting to American—even, one would suppose, to British—readers: too many of the people he talks about sound like very small potatoes indeed. And the defiance of chronology which helps to give the best of his novels the extraordinary power they have, is a questionable virtue in a memorialist. But neither of these limitations can keep "Return to Yesterday" from having quite exceptional interest as a picture of literary England before the Armageddon of 1914 (Mr. Ford's phrase); and, if it were only for the wonderfully cinematographic glimpses of Henry James, Kropotkin, Stephen Crane, W. H. Hudson and, of course, Conrad, the book would be a valuable one. In fact, it is valuable for more than these: by implication, at least, it is the record of a class culture in its deliquescence; and, though Mr. Ford is far from drawing that moral explicitly, he suggests that he is by no means unaware of its presence around the corner.

SUN YAT-SEN, by Henry Bond Restarick. *Preface by Kenneth Scott Latourette. New Haven: Yale University Press. 184 pages. $2.50.*

Sun Yat-sen's career before 1911 was extremely furtive. Not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

invented by a hunted revolutionist circumnavigating the globe on falsified passports persisted to confuse his hasty biographers. The author, a bishop in Hawaii, where Sun Yat-sen received his education, has taken the trouble to explore the sources and make orderly biography, for the first time, of his subject's early years. This is, perhaps, the book's sole virtue, but it is an important one in view of the untrustworthiness of the existing literature on Sun Yat-sen's career.

Philosophy

INTRODUCTION TO BEAUTY, by Van Meter Ames. *New York: Harper and Brothers. 280 pages. $2.50.*

Writing what is intended to serve as a popular introduction to esthetics, Professor Ames has divided his book into three sections, dealing respectively with esthetic theory, the fine arts, and the relation of art to ordinary life. All three sections are grouped round the author's basic thesis "that anything in the world which satisfies any desire may be regarded as beautiful; that anyone who uses intelligence and skill to fill a need is an artist; and that every work of man which ministers to want is a work of art." It is a thesis that will undoubtedly excite objections; for while it may express a side of the truth and possibly a much neglected side, it is obviously incomplete in that it does not tell us how to distinguish the experience of beauty from the experience of anything else. The author himself recognizes the difficulty in his preface, saying that he confesses he does not know how to draw the line between art and the rest of life without doing it arbitrarily and unfairly.

STRAIGHT AND CROOKED THINKING, by Robert H. Thouless. *New York: Simon and Schuster. 261 pages. $2.*

The number of methods by which men deceive one another in argument exceeds the number of formal violations and fallacies usually listed in the ordinary textbook on logic. The head of the Department of Psychology in Glasgow University examines, with quiet wit, thirty-four dishonest tricks of argumentation, which he illustrates in an appendix, concretely, and amazingly well, by an imaginary discussion among a professor, a clergyman and a business man. The differentiation he establishes between the "objective" and the "emotional" meanings of words permits him, or anyone else for that matter, to reduce whole discolored and enflamed paragraphs—editorials, literary judgments, etc.—to their proper, and often insignificant, meaning.

Travel

A NATURALIST IN BRAZIL, by Konrad Guenther. *Translated by Bernard Miall. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 400 pages, illustrated. $5.*

Dr. Guenther was invited by the Brazilian government to assist in its warfare against insect pests, but rarely has there been a warrior more sympathetic toward his enemy. He holds that all of nature is one organism: to destroy any species is, therefore, to mutilate this organism and in the long run to do more harm than good even from the selfish human standpoint. Despite a tendency to rhapsodize, the style is clear and persuasive. The omission of three chapters of undistinguished landscape painting and racial portraiture would improve the book. The other chapters are generously full of information, and the one on "The Tropical Forest" has made the jungle, with its special trees and creepers and its minute adaptations to the constant and excessive sunlight, more palpable to this reviewer than all the books on exploration and travel in the tropics that he has read before.

SEA DOGS OF TODAY, by A. J. Villiers. *New York: Henry Holt and Company. 325 pages. $2.50.*

This book contains fifteen sketches dealing with actual ships—with sailing ships for the most part—their owners, crews and voyages. Typical are the chapters on Carl Larsen, the whaler, on the Hull trawlermen and on a certain British shipping line. Mr. Villiers' material comes from three sources: his own experiences as a sailor, his questioning of other sailors and shipowners, and the perusal of old log-books. He has unearthed some good

JAPAN and CHINA

present their case to

AMERICA

CHINA SPEAKS

by CHIH MENG

With an Introduction by

W. W. YEN

Chinese Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States, Chief Delegate of China to the League of Nations, formerly Premier of the Republic of China.

Probable price $1.50

JAPAN SPEAKS

by K. K. KAWAKAMI

With an Introduction by His Excellency

TSUYOSHI INUKAI

Prime Minister of Japan

Probable price $1.50

At All Booksellers

Complete official statements of the belligerent nations are now for the first time available to American readers. Both volumes are essential to any understanding of the current Far Eastern situation.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY **NEW YORK**

DIGITIZED BY ARCHIVE.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yarns and offers interesting data to lovers of sail. The writer's own love of adventure *per se*, of "heroes" and ships, by betraying him into unrestraint, often makes his stories ineffective.

Fiction

FREE BORN, by Scott Nearing. *New York: Urquhart Press. $.50.*

"I shall make an example of you," the judge tells black Jim Rogers in the next to the last sentence of this "unpublished novel." Scott Nearing, in tracing the events of Jim's life from childhood, has done just that. As a single person, Jim Rogers has too much happen to him. Although he has typical experiences, he cannot himself be typical. "Free Born" is the story of an American "free born" Negro worker. It is a break from the Harlem fakery and tawdry romanticism pawned off as Negro life by Van Vechten, Bodenheim and their Negro and white counterparts. It is a break, too, from the genteel tradition which Dr. DuBois has been attempting to foster. The Negro worker whom Nearing has taken for the basis of his novel is a Negro worker, just that. Nearing is not writing of or for those "colored people" who attempt to imitate the white bourgeoisie. Reading "Free Born" one does not doubt the story; not until afterwards does one begin to think that all these things could not have been packed into the life of one person; but that is not too important. With American literature so deficient in novels of the class struggle, some faults are to be expected.

THE PHOENIX-KIND, by Peter Quennell. *New York: The Viking Press. $2.50.*

This English first novel is written in a style smooth as pool water, entirely from the viewpoint of Paul Hemingway, a candid, limpid and virginal character. The other actors in the story are devitalized for the sake of sophistication. Paul, a scholar, employs a kind, weary cleverness to inform us that Julian, his younger brother, is selfish and lazy, but that it is inevitable for him to receive good things. The love of Virginia is foremost among these benefits which Paul makes possible. The three go abroad together, and Virginia consoles Julian on a gloomy evening after he has read aloud to their embarrassed ears the manuscript of his novel. In her distress at the consequences of this episode, Virginia spends a sad, rainy, intimate night with Paul. Delicately she rejects him the next day when she learns that she is not to be a mother after all. And casually Julian decides that he will marry her.

Contributors

JOHN DEWEY's most recent contribution to his studies in the fields of philosophy, sociology and education is "Philosophy and Civilization," which was published last fall by Minton, Balch.

CARL SANDBURG, whose first book of verse, "Chicago Poems," appeared in 1916, has published six other volumes of poetry since and is now working on "Abraham Lincoln: The War Years," which will supplement his earlier biography of Lincoln.

JAMES RORTY, who was formerly a copywriter in a national advertising agency, is at present living on his farm in Connecticut and writing a book on advertising.

EDWARD DAHLBERG, author of "Bottom Dogs," recently completed a second novel called "Flushing to Calvary," and is now looking about, he says, "for a publisher who has the audacity to print it."

LINDSAY ROGERS, a frequent contributor to journals of political science, has been Burgess Professor of Public Law at Columbia University since 1929.

CUTHBERT WRIGHT, who has taught History, English, etc., at several preparatory schools, is the author of "Story of the Catholic Church." At the present time he is studying at Harvard University and preparing a book connected with the French religious wars.

Coal Areas Relief

American Friends Service Committee
(Quakers)

with the coöperation of the

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

32,000 School Children Now Being Fed in Thirty-five Counties of Six States Including West Virginia and Kentucky

No Discrimination on Any Grounds

42 Tons of Clothing Already Distributed

Rehabilitation Projects Being Started

Peak Mid-winter Load of Relief Makes Additional Funds and Clothing Urgent to Meet Increasing Demands

Starvation and Sickness Will Take Toll Unless Further Funds Are Received AT ONCE

Send Clothing (Prepaid):

From the East—
c/o American Friends Service Committee
"For Miners"
1515 Cherry Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

From the West—
c/o American Friends Service Committee
Morgantown, West Virginia.

Please make CHECKS payable to:

Miss Olive Van Horn
Treasurer, Coal Areas Relief, Room 415
105 East 22nd Street, New York, N. Y.

ALVA W. TAYLOR, *Chairman* JAMES MYERS, *Secretary*
Coal Areas Relief Committee

CLARENCE E. PICKETT, *Executive Secretary*
American Friends Service Committee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAY DAY CELEBRATIONS IN U. S. S. R.

- *Sailing on S. S. Bremen, April 13.*
- Including round trip third class transatlantic, second class rail Helsingfors-Leningrad, third class "roughing it" in the U. S. S. R.
- 10 days in Leningrad and Moscow.
- *Price from New York*.....$256
- Special trip to Dnieprostroi — 12 days in the U. S. S. R. $288

- - - - -

- *Sailing on S. S. Europa, April 20.*
- Including round trip tourist third cabin, second class rail Bremen to Moscow via Berlin, second category in the U. S. S. R.
- 10 days in Moscow and Leningrad.
- *Price from New York*.....$430

The OPEN ROAD

23rd Floor, 20-24 West 43rd Street, New York City

● Cooperating in U. S. S. R. with INTOURIST

Our Goal...

THE CONTROL *of* CANCER

Advances in knowledge of the nature of cancer and of its early symptoms have greatly increased chances of successful treatment. Surgery and radiation are the only recognized forms of treatment for cancer.

For free information write, call or telephone to the

NEW YORK CITY CANCER COMMITTEE

of the

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE CONTROL OF CANCER

34 East 75th Street, New York · RHinelander 4-0435

If not a resident of the Metropolitan area, write to

American Society for the Control of Cancer, New York, N.Y.

LECTURES

THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE

AT COOPER UNION

8th Street and Astor Place, at 8 o'clock

Admission Free

Friday, March 18

DR. HARRY A. OVERSTREET
"The Reorganization of Our Attitudes."

Sunday, March 20

DR. HORACE M. KALLEN
"Individualism as a Social Philosophy."

Tuesday, March 22

PROFESSOR FREDERICK BARRY
"The Historical Development of Scientific Method."

MUHLENBERG BRANCH LIBRARY

209 West 23rd Street, 8:30 o'clock

Thursday, March 24

PROFESSOR E. G. SPAULDING
"Types of Order."

GENERAL

Lucy Maxwell Hodge—Literary Adviser
6 Craigie Circle, Cambridge, Mass.

Trained in leading publishing house. Experienced aid for inexperienced authors from one thoroughly informed concerning standards of publishers and magazine editors.

The Most Profitable and Least Expensive way to pass your leisure hours is correspondence with intelligent people. Contacts, the only correspondence club for mentally isolated intellectuals, connects you with versatile, unconventional free spirits every-

TRAVEL

AN UNUSUAL TRIP FOR AN UNUSUAL PRICE

Motoring through Spain and France; touring England, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Russia. Steamship accommodations first class; hotels first class throughout. Party limited to ten persons traveling in two luxurious limousines. Price from New York to New York less than fourteen hundred. References exchanged. E. D. K., 73 Elm Street, Stamford, Conn.

MAGAZINES

OLD "New Age" readers and writers, during the years 1907-1922, are hereby notified that the first issue of a new weekly journal, under the editorship of Mr. A. R. Orage, will appear on Thursday, April 21st, 1932, under the title "THE NEW ENGLISH WEEKLY." Price 6d. Advance subscriptions invited. Home and Foreign 30/- per annum and pro rata.

Editorial and Publishing offices:
30 Cursitor Street, London, E. C. 4.

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper

THE PROGRESSIVE

Subscription Price $1.50 Per Year

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
3 Months
— 13 ISSUES —
20c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 20 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of

BOOKS

RAJA-YOGA or OCCULTISM

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

Twelve articles giving a comprehensive idea of what Raja-Yoga really is. Price, post paid 80c

THE ARYAN PATH
119 West 57th Street New York City

POSITIONS WANTED

Young woman with experience in tutoring wishes position with family. Has excellent references as to work, family and character. Address: Box 659, The New Republic.

Secretary-stenographer: knowledge bookkeeping, desires position where initiative, perseverance and intelligence will lead to advancement. Address: Box 654, The New Republic.

WANTED—Country life—Woman writer, ex-University instructor, wants part time job with country family. Could coach for College Board examinations, etc., etc. Box 326 Berkeley, California.

FOR RENT

Two unfurnished rooms, steam heat, fireplace, in remodeled house owned by The New Republic. Telephone: CHelsea 3-8393.

TYPING

Manuscripts and documents expertly typed. Excellent translations made into good English from French and German books, articles, especially political, social, historical themes. Moderate rates. Address Box M. S., The New Republic, or phone JErome 7-6000.

Manuscripts and plays typed by experi-

LICENSED TO UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED